

LETTER

TO THE

**REMARKER ON THE LAYMAN'S
SCRIPTURAL CONFUTATION.**

WHEREIN THE
DIVINITY OF THE SON OF GOD
IS FARTHER VINDICATED

AGAINST THE
REMARKER'S EXCEPTIONS.

TO WHICH IS ADDED,

AN APPENDIX,

TAKING SOME NOTICE OF
MR. LINDSEY'S SEQUEL.

BY THOMAS RANDOLPH, D.D.

President of C.C.C. and LADY MARGARET'S PROFESSOR of Divinity in the
University of OXFORD.

O X F O R D,

AT THE CLARENDON PRESS. MDCCCLXXVII.

Sold by J. and J. FLETCHER in the *Turle*; and by J. F.
and C. RIVINGTON, St. Paul's Church-Yard, *London*.

L E T T E R

TO THE

REMARKER on the LAYMAN'S
SCRIPTURAL CONFUTATION.

WHEREIN THE

Imprimatur, of the

IS FURTHER INDICATED
G. HORNE,

VICE-CH. Oxon.

Oct. 24. 1776.

REMARKER'S EXCELLENCE

TO WHICH IS ADDED

A N. A. P. L. I. N. D. I. X.

TAKING SOME NOTICE OF

MR. LINDSEY'S SEQUEL.

BY THOMAS WINDOLPH, D. D.
Rector of Lady Margaret's
College of Divinity in the
University of Oxford.



O X F O R D
AT THE CLARENCEON PRESS, MDCCLXXVI.

LETTER
TO THE
REMARKER ON THE LAYMAN'S
SCRIPTURAL CONFUTATION, &c.

SIR,
WHEN I read over your Remarks on
—Mr. B—'s *Scriptural Confutation*,
I stood amaz'd at the strange Confi-
dence, and Assurance, with which you revived
old Objections, which have so often received a
full Answer; at the contemptuous Insolence,
with which you treat every one, who presumes
to differ from you, and particularly at the scurri-
lity and abuse, which you bestow so liberally on
Mr. B—. 'You call him an *Atbanasian* not
easily to be conquered, who has as many Shifts
as a Weather-beaten Tree. You charge him with
'shameless Sophistry, Bigotry, and Prejudice;
'childish Conceits, innumerable Sophisms, violati-
ons of the Rules of Logick and Grammar, de-
throning common Sense, heaping up mighty Moun-
tains of deformed Rubbish, and erecting a Fortrefs
on the Surface of a Fog. These are some of your
Flowers of Rhetorick, which supply the Place

of Argument. In like Manner you treat Mr. *Fisher*, a worthy Country Clergyman, who has presumed to offer some Remarks on your wonderful Performance. You pass over most of his Arguments with contemptuous silence. You promise to write to him with Christian mildness, and moderation: and yet you treat him throughout with the greatest Insolence*. You tell him that you leave the greatest Part of his Remarks to be carried the Way of all mortal Writings, by their own internal Principles of decay,—and add—*If the Pages inscribed by me can live, let them live*—A most magisterial Way this of dismissing what you cannot answer†. You charge him with cool and deliberate dissimulation, and call upon him to estimate his own criminality‡, though in another Place you are so good as to hope it is ignorance, and not dishonesty. As no one has hitherto made any Reply to this your Second Edition, I have ventured to offer these few Remarks to you, in order, if possible, to stop this your confident boasting, or at least to prevent the unwary Reader from being misled by it, who may take Assurance for Argument. I might indeed justly decline this Task. Some Years ago I wrote a *Vindication of the Doctrine of the Trinity*, in Answer to Bp. *Clayton*: and last Year I published a *Vindication of the Wor-*

* P. 143.

† P. 156, 171.

‡ P. 156.

§ P. 151.

Ship of the Son and the Holy Ghost, in Answer to Mr. Lindsey. I might reasonably wait till what I there advanced had received an Answer, before I offered any thing farther. But, as the Subject is of the highest Importance, and, as I find every Pamphlet published against the Doctrine of the Trinity, though containing nothing new, or worthy of Remark, yet, if not particularly answered, cried up as unanswerable, I have thought proper once more to take up my Pen in Defence of this important Doctrine, though in many Instances I can only repeat what I have said before. What I here offer, and what I have before advanced, will I hope, fully obviate every thing you have alledged: and afford a full, and satisfactory Proof of our *Lords true Divinity.*

What you have said about the Certainty of Reason has been fully considered by Mr. Fisher: and you have advanced little or nothing in Answer to him. And, as this Point, also has been well handled by several able Writers, I need not add much on this Head. Thus far I readily agree with you, that *Reason is the Gift of God,* and that in things within its Province it can determine with sufficient Certainty; that it teaches us infallibly that there is but one Supreme God, and that there are neither more nor fewer;

and that he is infinitely wise, just, and true. But when you add that whoever is not underived, and self-existent, whoever receives his Attributes from, and holds them at the pleasure of another, cannot be God, here I must stop. And I must first ask you how this latter clause comes to be foisted in? The Persons you dispute with hold that the Divine Attributes and Essence are derived from the Father to the Son; but that he holds them at his arbitrary Pleasure none of them maintain.

As to the Title of *Supreme God*, or the *Supreme God*, I don't know that it is given to our Saviour in any of our Creeds, or Articles. As to your Application of it be pleased to accept the Answer which Dr. Waterland made to the same Kind of Sophistry not many Years ago.—

None I hope can be imposed on by such weak Fallacies, but they that want their Faculties of discerning. Let the Reader carefully distinguish three Things, and he will then be able of himself to unravel all your Pretences. First, *Supremacy of Power*, or *Supremacy of Perfection*, is to be possessed of all Perfection, and the highest Excellency possible. And this it is to be God. There is nothing of this Kind but what is common to Father and Son, who are therefore one God Supreme. Not as you talk, one and another, but one and

the same. And this is the constant Doctrine of Antiquity. Secondly, Supremacy of Order consists in this, that the Father has his Perfections, Dominion, &c. from none; but the Son from the Father. All that the Son has is referred up to the Father, and not vice versa. This Kind of Supremacy is of the Father alone. And the Son's Subordination thus understood, is very consistent with his equality of Nature, Dominion, Perfection and Glory, according to all Antiquity. Thirdly, Supremacy of Office. This by mutual Agreement, and voluntary Oeconomy, belongs to the Father: while the Son out of voluntary Condescension submits to act ministerially, or in Capacity of Mediator. And most of the Texts, which you cite to prove the Son's inferiority, relate to him in this Capacity. But this, as the same excellent Writer elsewhere observes, acting by a delegated Power does by no means infer any inferiority of Nature: but rather the contrary, if the Charge be such as no inferior Nature is able to sustain, as the Case is here.

What we say then is this. We find a Second Person every where in Scripture called the Son of God, and that in a peculiar Manner, his own Son, his beloved Son, his one Son, his well-beloved, his only begotten Son, which is in

1 First Defence of Queries, p. 289. 2 *Ibid* 45. Rom. viii. 32.
3 Matt. iii. 177.—xvii. 5. 4 Mar. xii. 46. 5 Job. i. 14.—
18. iii.—16. 18.—1 Job. iv. 9. See Bull. Judic. Eccles. Cathol.
Cap. v. Op. p. 313, &c. Pearson on the Creed, p. 138, &c.

the Bosom of his Father. 'He is called *the Son of God* in Opposition and Preference to all Creatures. The highest *Angels* are only *ministering Spirits*: but unto the Son he saith—*Thy Throne O God, is for ever and ever*: And all the *Angels of God* are called on to *worship him*. This Title must certainly import something analagous to the Relation between an earthly *Father* and *Son*: and the most natural and obvious Sense of it denotes an Equality of Nature.' But you are pleased to tell us that, *if God and Son of God are equivalent Terms, then Adam was God, for of him it is written, which was the Son of God.* It is so written: and so are 'Angels, and 'all good *Christians* called in *Scripture* the *Sons of God*. You yourself have I hope, a Title to this Appellation. But would not you think it extreme Presumption to call yourself *the one proper Son, the only begotten Son of God*? Could the most exalted Creature in the Universe call himself so? Other inferior Beings may be, and have been, called the *Sons of God* in a figurative, or lower Sense: but the Title of *God's own Son, his only begotten Son*, are Appellations too high, not only for *Adam*, or any of the *Sons of Adam*, but for any of the *Angels of God* to bear. If such Titles import not an Equality of Nature, it will be hard to say what Ideas they were designed to convey. But still farther, to this *Son*

'*Heb. i. 4. &c.* 'P. 127. 'Job. xxxviii. 7 'Job. i. 12.

of God is given in Scripture every Name, Title and Attribute of the Divinity. He is called *Jehovah*, "God with us," *the mighty God*, "the great God," *the true God*, "God over all, blessed for ever," *the Lord of Glory*, "the Lord of Hosts," *the King of Kings*, and *Lord of Lords*, "the Almighty." He is said to have created all Things, and to uphold all Things by the Word of his Power. To him is ascribed "Omniscience," "Omnipresence," "Immutability" and "Eternity." And this also in the most emphatical Manner. "I am (saith Christ of himself) he who searcheth the Reins, and the Hearts, the Alpha and the Omega, the First and the Last, he who is, and who was, and who is to come, the Almighty." But the Scriptures, as well as Reason, teach us that there is one only God. And therefore we conclude that the Son is so united with the Father as to be one God with him. It lies upon you to prove the negative, that no Union whatever can make two Persons one Being, one God.

^a Comp. *Job*. xii. 41. and *Is*. vi. 1.—*Matt*. xi. 10. and *Mal*. iii. 1. ^b *Matt*. i. 23. ^c *Is*. ix. 16. ^d *Ti*. ii. 13. See *Waterland's* Sermons, p. 214. ^e *Job*. v. 30. See D^o. p. 206. ^f *Rom*. ix. 5. See D^o. 221. ^g *1 Cor*. ii. 8. ^h Comp. *Job*. xii. 41. and *Is*. xi. 5. ⁱ *Rev*. xvii. 14.—xix. 16. ^k *Rev*. i. 8. See *Waterl.* Sermon, p. 227. ^l *Col*. i. 16. *Job*. i. 2. ^m *Heb*. i. 3. ⁿ *Job*. xvi. 30.—xxi. 17.—ii. 24, 25. ^o *Matt*. xviii. 20. ^p *Heb*. xiii. 8. ^q *Rev*. i. 8. ^r *Rev*. ii. 23.—i. 11. ^s These Texts of Scripture, at least the chief of them, shall be more fully considered hereafter, and vindicated from all exceptions.

• You

" You are to shew the Supposition to be impossible in the nature of the Thing. In order to which you must, as I apprehend, fix a Principle of Individuation, and settle the precise Sense of Sameness, and the several Kinds of it, and that not only with regard to human Persons, but to the *Divine Nature*. This is a Question, which has puzzled the greatest Masters of Reason: and which I may reasonably presume is above your Capacity to give a clear Solution of."

Again. The Title of the *Son of God* implies a distinction from, and some Kind of Subordination to the *Father*. And therefore the *Son* is by all the ancient Writers held to be in some Sense inferior to the *Father*, and that even with regard to his *Divine Nature*. The *Father* they call the First Person, the *Son* the Second: the *Father* they all represent as unbegotten, receiving his Being and Attributes from none but himself: the *Son* they teach to be *God of God, begotten of the Father*, and receiving his Nature and Attributes from him; but yet *co-eternal and co-equal with the Father*, receiving of him from all Eternity the same entire and undivided Essence. And this they illustrate by the Comparison of Water flowing from a

" See Dr. *Waterland's* 1st. and 2d. Defence, Q. ix.

" See *Bull*, Def. Fid. Sect. iv. See also my *Vindict*, of the Doct. of the *Trinity* and Authors there cited, P. II. p. 71.

Fountain, or Light from the Sun, which, though distinct from, are yet necessarily co-existing with the Source, from whence they issue. And the Apostle uses the same Comparison*. He styles the Son—*ἀπαύλας* & *ἀκτὴς*—the bright Ray, or emanation of the Glory of the Father.

But you say that *whoever is not underived and self-existent is not supreme God*.—But you tell us not what you mean by *self-existent*: it is no scriptural Term. You seem to confound two Things which ought to be kept distinct, *necessary existence*, and *self-existence*. By *necessary existent* usually has been understood what always has existed, and must exist, eternally, and immutably: by *self-existent* what is no way derived from any prior, co-æval Cause, or Principle. The former is a positive Idea—*necessary*—the latter a negative Idea—*underived*: the first answers to the Question what a Thing is; the latter to the Question whence a Thing is. The Ideas are therefore plainly distinct: and it is at least possible to suppose a Being eternal, and necessary, and yet not underived. If we say then that the Son is derived from the Father (as the Term Son indeed imports) why may not this Emanation be eter-

* Heb. i. 3.

* See Waterland's Defence, Q. viii.

nal, immutable, and necessary? If you could have brought any Proof to the contrary, it had been more to the Purpose than your Gingle of Words about *one Supreme God, and another Supreme God*. But your Reason concludes *so with intuitive certainty*. As I am not possessed of this intuitive Knowledge, you must excuse me, Sir, if I choose rather to take the Apostle's Word than yours. *' St. John teaches me that the Word was the only-begotten Son of the Father, and therefore derived from the Father. But just before he tells us that the Word was in the Beginning with God, and was God.*

Lastly, you tell us that *whoever is not without Body, Parts, or Passions, is not Supreme God*. Here, Sir, I must again beg leave to ask you a Question or two. You allow, I think, the *Pre-existence of the Logos*, *' that he was a most stupendously glorious Being, ' and that he was in Heaven, before he appeared here on Earth. If, Sir, you will be pleased to explain how such a glorious Being could take upon him the Nature of Man, and be made Flesh, you may then possibly be able to comprehend how the divine Nature could be united to the human. As God is without Body, Parts, or human Passions, so*

*' Job. i. 1. 14.**' P. 14.**' P. 31.*

also is an Angel. I must own that these Things are above my Comprehension: and I presume they are above yours too. You cannot explain the Nature of the Union of your own Soul and Body. This, and several other Things relative to the Divine Nature, Mr. *Fisher* called upon you to explain: to all which you vouchsafe no Answer, but only Insolence, and Abuse. * You charge him with gross misrepresentation of you, and call upon him to estimate his own Criminality. And wherein does this Criminality consist? He calls your boasted *Reason the Wisdom of this World*, which you say is a quite different, and contrary Thing. But be pleased, Sir, to look again into your Bible: * and you will find that St. Paul is speaking, not of the *Wisdom* of the covetous or ambitious Worldling, but of the *Wisdom* of the Philosophers and wise Men among the *Gentiles*. There were many Things in the *Gospel* no way agreeable to their pre-conceived Notions: and therefore the Doctrine of *Christ* was *Foolishness to them*. I can really see but little difference between their *Wisdom* and yours. Their boasted *Wisdom* prevented them from receiving a Doctrine, which they could not comprehend: your *Reason* permits you in-

* P. 151.

* P. 156.

* 1 Cor. i. 17, &c.

deed to receive the Gospel, but teaches you to explain away every Thing in it above your Comprehension. Dr. *Whitby* has a Note on this Place very apposite to the Purpose. He gives us a Citation from *Justin the Martyr*.—*They count us mad. (says that ancient Father) that after the immutable and eternal God, we give the Second Place to a Man that was crucified, not knowing the Mystery of this Doctrine.*—Your Reason teaches you to deny the same Doctrine on the same Principles. Whereas the Scripture tells us that the Word was God, and that the Word was made Flesh, your Reason concludes with intuitive certainty that God is without Body, Parts, or Passions, and therefore could not be made Flesh.

But you tell us that the Doctrine of Transubstantiation is not more shocking to Reason and common Sense, and that hereby great Advantages are afforded to the Emissaries of Rome. Yes, Sir, I know that this has been urged by Popish Priests: and I cannot but wonder to see this exploded Objection of theirs revived by a Protestant Writer. This very Argument was made

• Apol. ii. p. 60. In what Sense *Justin* says that the Son is to be honoured in the Second Place. See *Bull Def. Fid. Nic.* Sect. iv. C. 2.

• P. 78, 79.

Use of by a *Papish* Writer in the last Century, And strange is it you should not know that it was fully confuted by many of our ablest Divines, Dr. *Sherlock*, Bp. *Kidder*, Bp. *Stillington*, and others. But, as you seem ignorant of it, I will give you in as few Words as I can the Substance of what is advanced by these learned Writers, referring you to themselves for farther Satisfaction. The first Reason then why we believe the Doctrine of the *Trinity*, and not that of *Transubstantiation*, is because the one depends upon one single Expression, which may, and must, be understood figuratively, and hath other Phrases joined with it confessedly figurative: the other is taught in a variety of Expressions, and in numberless Passages of *Scripture*. Another Reason why we believe the Doctrine of the *Trinity*, and not that of *Transubstantiation*, is, because the one is plainly taught in *Scripture*, the other is not at all taught there. Our blessed Saviour calls the Bread his Body, which was broken, and the Wine his Blood which was shed, whereas his Body was not then broken, nor his Blood shed.

* See also a Sermon lately published by the Dean of Gloucester, which I had not seen when I wrote this.

† This is proved at large by Bp. *Stillington* in his Treatise entitled—*The Doctrine of the Trinity and Transubstantiation compared*, P. 2d.

The

The Doctrine therefore of *Transubstantiation* is inconsistent with the Words themselves, and is contrary to the most plain, obvious, and natural Sense of them. Nor could the Apostles possibly understand our Lord in such Sense, or imagine that he held out to them his Body in his own Hands, or gave them to drink of his own Blood, which they perceived still flowing in his Veins. Thirdly we believe the Doctrine of the *Trinity* rather than that of *Transubstantiation*, because this relates to an Object within the Cognizance of our Senses, and Understanding, the other relates to an Object, infinite, and incomprehensible. Our Senses were given us to judge of the Objects around us: and, if they in any Particular constantly, and unavoidably, deceive us, there is an End of all Certainty. The main Evidence of the Truth of the *Christian* Religion is drawn from Facts, which could be known only by the Testimony of our Senses. It is by our Senses alone that we can know any Words (these Words, for Instance, of Consecration) to be in our Bible: and therefore no Doctrine can be proved from *Scripture*, which teaches us to disbelieve the plain Evidence of all our Senses. This cannot be said with Regard to the Doctrine of the *Trinity*. The *Divine Nature* and Manner of Existence is most

moſt

most undoubtedly a Subject above the Comprehension either of our Senses, or our Reason. In the one Case the Subject is a Body; in the other a Spirit: in the one finite, comprehensible, and obvious to our Senses; in the other infinite, and incomprehensible. The two Cases therefore are as widely distant, as the Heaven is from the Earth. Lastly, we cannot believe *Transubstantiation*, because it implies not only one, but many Contradictions: we believe the Doctrine of the *Trinity*, because we cannot see in it any real Contradiction. * But you tell us that *the present Doctrine, that three Supreme Gods are but one Supreme God, makes a Part of our Church Establishment*. Pray, Sir, where do you find such a Proposition in any of our Articles, or Creeds. But perhaps you will say it is no other than the necessary Consequence of our Doctrine. I answer in the Words of Bp. *Stillingfleet*—* *We do not say that three Persons are but one Person, or that one Nature is three Natures, but that there are three Persons in one Nature. If therefore one individual Nature be communicable to three Persons, there is no Appearance of Absurdity in this Doctrine.* * To the

1. P. 78.

* Trin. and Trinit. compared, Pt. II.

P. 24.

* Works Fel. Vol. II. Serms 99. p. 744.

same Purpose speaks the worthy A. B^r. Tillotson — *There is much Malice in this Objection: but there is little Strength. Is it any Contradiction to say that the same Thing should be three, and one, in several Respects, which is all that the Scripture teacheth concerning the Trinity?—And* I may add too, that it is all that the *Athanasian Creed* teacheth. I am therefore under no Apprehension of giving any Advantage to the *Papists* by this, or any of our Doctrines. All their Arguments of this Kind have been long ago fully answered. My Fears lie quite another Way. As far as my Observations have reached, I have found that the great Argument made use of by the *Popish Emissaries* is drawn from the great Hazard that is run, and the ill Consequences which follow, on Men's deserting their Mother Church. There is no Certainty, they tell us, without *Infallibility*: no Foundation, but on *St. Peter's Rock*. When Men, say they, forsake this infallible Guide, and trust to their own private Spirit, they run into the most extravagant Notions, and * most damnable *Heresies*, even denying the Lord that bought them. This is the great Sophism, which perverts weak Minds, and keeps many steadfast in their Church. And now, Sir, let me desire you to

* 1 *Pet.* ii. 1.

consider

consider whether by retailing their malicious, and weak Objections, with regard to the Doctrine of the Trinity, and adopting their Sophistry in Vindication of the Worship of Angels, you take not the readiest Method to carry us back to Popery, and from Popery to Paganism. ¹ Your Explication of Rev. xvii. 8. is just the same with that of Bellarmin. Celsus also taught the same Doctrine, that *Worship* was to be paid to inferior *Deities* commissioned by God. ² But Origen answers, that *Christians never worshipped any of the Ministers of God, but one only God, and his only Son, and Word, and Image, with Supplications, and Prayers, to the utmost of their Power offering up our Prayers to the God of the Universe by his only-begotten Son, to whom first we offer them, beseeching him, as our High-Priest, to offer them to the God over all.*

It is Time now to come to your Proofs drawn from Scripture. ¹ You enter on them with an Air of Triumph. Having first resolved not to renounce your Reason, you thank God that you find no such Proposition, expressed, or implied from the

¹ P. 106. He, like you, thinks this an Argument for the *Worship of Angels*. He says, *St Johannes putavit esse Angelum, et tamen adoravit, cur nos reprehendimur, qui facimus quod Johannes fecit. De Sanct. Beat. L. I. C. 14.* ² V. Origen. L. viii. p. 380. 399. 400. ³ Ib. p. 386. ⁴ P. 9.

first to the last Chapter of your Bible. I think you had better have staid till you had obtained the Victory, before you sang your *Te Deum*. But pray what Proposition do not you find there? That *Christ is God* is both expressly taught, and plainly implied. But the *Scriptures* teach you *that there is but one living and true God*. This we readily acknowledge. But you bring Texts, which, you say, *absolutely exclude the Son by Name*, such as *Job. xvii. 3.* and *1 Cor. viii. 6.* * To this Mr. Fisher thought it sufficient to answer that the first Text *neither expressly affirms, nor denies him, to be God*. And with regard to the latter, he assigns very good Reasons why we are not to suppose the Father to be called God, or the Son Lord, *exclusive of each other*, but to exclude other supposed and false Gods, and Lords. But to this you reply only with Contempt, and Insolence. You call it *Nonsense*—you cannot confute it—it is *safe in its own Tenuity*, &c. &c.—And this is your *Mildness, and Christian Moderation*. And yet Mr. Fisher says no more than what the best Commentators, and many able Writers, have said before him; and not only said, but proved. † *Grotius thus interprets*

* P. 29, &c.

† P. 159.

‡ See also *Waterland's Sermons*, p. 54. &c.—1st. Defence, p. 8. &c. and 2d. Def. p. 55, 436. *Pearson on the Creed*, p. 126.

interprets Job. xvii. 3. *Ut agnoscant te solum Deum, exclusis omnibus iis quos falsa Gentium persuasio introduxerat.* And Dr. Whitby thus comments on 1 Cor. i. 8. *As the Apostle by saying there is one Lord, viz. Jesus Christ, cannot be reasonably supposed to exclude the Father from being Lord of Christians, so neither by saying there is one God, the Father, ought he to be supposed to exclude Jesus Christ from being the God of Christians, especially, if we consider that he is here styled the one Lord by whom are all Things, as he is Eph. iii. 9. Col. i. 16.* Nor are these Distinctions lately invented to evade the Force of these Texts: they have always in the most early Ages been understood in the same Sense, ** Novatian thus argues—Est ergo credendum secundum præscriptum in Dominum unum verum Deum, et in eum quem misit Jesum Christum consequenter, qui se nequaquam Patri, ut diximus, junxisset, nisi Deum quoque intelligi vellet.—*^a And thus says Tertullian—*Unus Deus Pater, et absque eo alius non est. Quod ipse inferens non Filium negat, sed alium Deum. Cæterum alius a Patre*

p. 126. *Cortman*, Vol. I, Disc. I, Twelfth Sermon on 1 Cor. v. 8. *My Vindie*, p. 63, &c. *Fidus Body of Divinity*, p. 382, 3. ^a *De Trin.* C. 24. ^b *Adv. Prax.* C. 18. v. Ibid. C. 13.—*Iren.* adv. Hæres Lib. iii. C. 6, Lib. iv. C. 14. P. 302.—*Origen Comm.* in *Rom.* ix. 5.

Filius non est. You are pleased to cry *Shame* to Mr. Fisher, you would do better to take the *Shame* to yourself.

But what you most triumph in is the Text, *Mar. xiii. 32.* where our Saviour speaking of the Day of his coming, says that of that Day and Hour knoweth no Man, no not the Angels which are in Heaven, neither the Son, but the Father'. You tell us that to say that the personal Pronouns, I, Thou, He, are frequently spoken not of whole Christ, but of a very inconsiderable Part of him, is a Conceit, which absolutely destroys all Certainty in Language. 'You call it a pitiful Sophistry, and dividing the Person of Christ. 'And again in your Letter to Mr. Fisher, after some Language not very decent, you defy him to produce a single Text by way of proving that the personal Pronouns applied to Jesus Christ do not mean his whole Person.—But suppose that we allow these Pronouns to mean his whole Person, what then? As Jesus Christ is one Person, so in that Person two Natures were united, the divine, and the human. And will you say that it destroys all Certainty of Language to apply that to the whole Person, which is true only of one constituent Part. Nothing is more

common. You yourself are, I presume, a *Person* consisting of two Parts, a Soul and a Body. Let us see then how these *Personal Pronouns* may be applied to yourself. You say,—I think: but what is it that thinks? not your Body, but only your Soul. *Thou* breathest too: but it is not thy Soul, but thy Lungs that breathe: Man may be said to be both mortal and immortal: mortal with Respect to his Body, and immortal with Respect to his Soul. But we cannot produce a single Text. What think you of this?—'Dust thou art, and unto Dust shalt thou return—said God to Adam'. And yet Solomon teaches us that the Dust shall return to the Earth, as it was: and the Spirit shall return unto God, who gave it. And with regard to the Person of Christ, 'we read that Jesus wept: but I presume this is spoken not of whole Christ, but of a very inconsiderable Part of him. 'Again Jesus, when on the Cross, said I thirst, which could relate only to his Body. 'When in the Garden he was sorrowful, and very heavy, it was his Soul, which was so exceeding sorrowful. 'He told Nicodemus that he came down from Heaven: but neither his Body, nor his Soul, came down from

* Gen. iii. 19.

† Eccles. xii. 7.

‡ Job. xi. 35.

• Job. xix. 28.

• Matt. xxvi, 37, 8.

• Job. iii. 17.

Heaven;

Heaven; but that Nature, which was in Heaven, in Glory before the World was. And yet here you run Riot for several Pages together — *The Interests of the Cause were at Stake. For without this Shift Athanasianism is gone for ever —* * *such Equivocations come with little Propriety from the Mouth of God, and are with as little Decency forced upon him by the whole Tribe of Athanasians. — On such pitiful Sophistry the whole of your System is founded.* * And yet you are very angry if you are charged with *Scurrility and Abuse.* And you fall very severely on Mr. B. for his contemptuous Treatment of his Adversaries. I shall not attempt to justify every thing, which that Gentleman has written. However some Excuse may be allowed to a Man, who writes in Defence of the established Religion of his Country, of Doctrines, which he has been taught to look upon as sacred. But surely one who writes against the established Religion, ought to do it *in the Spirit of Meekness.* Contemptuous, and opprobrious, Language is in such a Writer wholly inexcusable. After all you seem to want some such *Shift* yourself. * You allow the *Son to have been in Heaven.* before he appeared on Earth, * and to have been *next to*

* Job. xvii. 5. * P. 19. * P. 21. * P. 43.
* P. 31. * P. 94.

the Supreme God, the most glorious Being in the Universe. I must desire you then to explain how this *stupendously glorious Being*, when united to human Nature, could be said to *increase in Wisdom* as he grew up. * I am afraid you must have Recourse to the like *Sophistry*, that our Lord might be said in one Respect not to know, what in another he did know.

But, if this does not please you, I can help you to another Solution, which perhaps, you may like better, as it is espoused by the celebrated Dr. Clarke. I think (says he) the Intention of our Saviour in this Passage is, to declare that, as the Father alone is (AUGUST) God unoriginate, and of himself—so he is likewise the alone Fountain of all Knowledge, insomuch that no one knows any thing, no not even the Son himself, but by Communication from him. † And he quotes Irenæus for this Sense. This Passage of Irenæus is well worthy our Attention. Thus says that ancient Father—* If any enquire on what Account, the Father,

* See Grotius. Whitby Annot. Lightfoot Heb. and Talmud Exerc. Dr. Cockman and Dr. Twiss's Sermon on the Text.

† Reply to Mr. Nelson, p. 171.

‡ Script. Doct. Trin.

Nº. 773. § Siquis inquirit causam, propter quam in omnibus Pater communicans Filio, solus scire horam, et diem a Domino manifestatus est, usque aptabilem magis, neque decentiorem, nec sine periculo alteram, quam hanc inveniat in presenti (quoniam enim solus

Father, who communicates in all things with the Son, is here set forth by our Lord, as the only Person, who knew that Day, and Hour, he cannot at present find any fitter, or more decent, or indeed any other safe Answer than this, (as our Lord is the only Teacher of Truth) that we might learn from him that the Father is above all. For he says, the Father is greater than I. And therefore the Father is declared by our Lord to have the Preference with regard to Knowledge, that we also, while we live in this World, may leave perfect Knowledge, and all such Questions to God. — In the preceding Chapter Irenæus, in order to check the vain Presumption and Arrogance of the Gnosticks, pretending to search into the Mysteries of God, makes use of this Argument, that the Son of God himself was pleased to refer the Knowledge of the Day and Hour of Judgment to the Father only, thereby designing to teach us, that while we converse here below, it becomes us not to pretend to high things, but to leave such Questions to God alone. But appre-

verax magister est Dominus) ut discamus per ipsum super omnia esse Patrem. Etenim Pater, ait, major me est. Et secundum igitur agnitionem præpositus esse Pater annunciatu est a Domino nostro. ad hoc, ut et nos, in quantum in figura hujus mundi sumus, perfectam scientiam et tales questiones, concedamus Deo. Adv. Hær. L. ii. C. 49. P. 178. See Waterland's 1st. and 2d. Def. Q. vii.

hending

tending that what he had said of our *Blessed Saviour* might be liable to Exception, and be misunderstood, he here explains himself. We are hereby, he says, taught to refer all things to *the Father*, as the Original: and therefore in this Respect too our *Saviour* yields to him *the Preference*, as became him, especially while here on Earth: not, as if he knew less, but because what he knew, he knew by *Communication from the Father*. That *Irenæus* did not hereby design to deny the *Omniscience* of *the Son* is plain, because, not only in other Parts of this Work he attributes *Omniscience* to him: but just before in this very Chapter, he tells us that *the Spirit of our Saviour which was in him, searcheth all things, yea the deep things of God*. The same appears from the Passage itself. *The Father* is here said to *communicate with the Son in all things*. But from hence arose a Difficulty which required Explication, viz. how our *Lord* could say consistently with this that *he knew not the Day of Judgment*. Had *Irenæus* not believed the *Son* to be *Omniscient*, no Difficulty could have stuck with him. He would not have been so concerned about the *Fitness*, and *Decency* of his Interpretation, and that it might be *sine periculo*. Accordingly he does not ask why

¹ Lib. ii. C. 25, 43. Lib. v. C. 18.

the Father only knew, but why he alone was said to know—solus scire manifestatus est.—Nor does he say that *the Father* is more knowing than *the Son*, but *præpositus* only, *set before*, *having the Preference*, which may be conceiv'd, though both be equally knowing: and, for the greater Caution, it is not absolutely said—*præpositus est*—but *præpositus esse annunciatus est*—he is declared, or said, to have the Preference. So that the Question with *Irenæus* was, not whether *the Father* was more knowing than *the Son*, but why, since both were omniscient, our Saviour makes such a Declaration, as gave the Preference to *the Father*. And the Reasons he assigns are, First, to instruct us that *the Father* is the Fountain, and Original of *the Son* himself, who, as Son, derived ^a in a manner inscrutable to us, his Essence, and Attributes from *the Father*. Secondly, because in his then present State of Humiliation it became him to refer all things to *the Father*. Thirdly, that it might be an useful Example of Humility, and Modesty, to us, that we much rather, while we are here below, may not pretend to high things, nor pretend to search into *the deep things of God*. I have dwelt the longer on this Passage, because I think it

^a Inenarrabilis generatio ejus. *Iren, ib.*

appears clearly from it, not only that *Irenaeus* himself believed our Lord's *Omniscience*, but also that it was the general Opinion in his Time, in the second Century. If not, he need not have feared giving any Offence by saying any thing, which might seem to clash with this Doctrine. And I have enlarged the more on this Point, in order, if possible, to stop your confident boasting, and teach you a little more Modesty, and Decency. You are pleased, Sir, continually to call us *Athanasians*, and our Doctrine *Athanasianism*, by way of Reproach. Be it known to you that the Primitive *Christians*, long before *Athanasius* was born, held the same Doctrines, and put the same Interpretations on *Scripture*, that we do.

That the Son of God is omniscient you yourself must allow, if you hold him to be the Object of *Worship*. ¹ And the *Scriptures* teach us that in him are hid all the Treasures of Wisdom, and Knowledge. ² He is said to know all things, ³ to know all Men; to know what was in Man. ⁴ He is frequently represented as knowing Men's Thoughts. ⁵ He himself in the most emphatical Manner styles himself—I am he which searcheth

¹ Col. ii. 3. ² Job. xvi. 30. xxi. 17. ³ Job. ii. 24. 25.

⁴ Matt. ix. 4. xii. 25. Luk. ix. 47. Job. vi. 64: ⁵ Rev. ii. 23.]

the Reins and Hearts: by which very Title *the Supreme God* is in *Scripture* distinguished—*thou, even thou only* (said *Solomon* to *God*) *knowest the Hearts of all the Children of Men.*

As to your other Texts, which seem to denote an Inferiority in the *Son*, I have already fully considered them in my *Vindic. Doct. Trin.* P. ii. p. 37, &c. and in my Answer to Mr. *Lindsey*, p. 23, &c. You have the latter by you, to this therefore I refer you: and also to Mr. *Bingham's* Vindication. I shall only add that we acknowledge *Christ* not only to be inferior to the *Father* in respect to his human Nature, but also with respect to his mediatorial Office, and still farther with regard to his divine Nature, as *God of God*, there is an Inferiority of Order, but not of Nature. And the Distinction of *Persons* in the *Godhead*, and his mediatorial Office, were Doctrines necessary to be taught. Nay his divine Mission was most peculiarly necessary to be insisted on in his Discourses with the *Jews*.

I come now to consider the Proofs of our *Lords Divinity*, which you have endeavoured to explain to another Sense. But here too I have in many Instances replied to your Answers before

they came out. Thus to your Interpretation of *Job. viii. 58.* you will find a full Reply in my Answer to Mr. *Lindsey*.

I have also there given you an Answer to what you say on *Job. x. 30.* 'You tell us that in the Original the Word is not—*is*—but—*is*— Very true—not one Person, but one Substance. And in this Sense the ancient Writers understood it: *Tertullian* thus interprets it—' *Ego et Pater unum sumus, ad substantiæ unitatem, non ad numeri singularitatem.* And again.—' *Et nunquam separatus a Patre, aut alius a Patre quia—Ego et Pater unum sumus.* To the same Purpose speaks *Novatian*—' *Cum nullius hominis hæc vox esse possit—Ego et Pater unum sumus, hanc vocem de conscientia Divinitatis Christus solus edicit.* And so also *Origen*, whose Words I will give you in English—' *If Celsus had understood this—I and my Father are One, he would not have imagined that we worshipped another besides the God of the Universe—for we worship one God, the Father and the Son.* But you with great Confidence ask Mr. *B*— *Do you not know that this very Answer has been given a thousand times?* Yes, we do know, Sir, that it is yours, and your Friends Practice, to urge the same Ob-

¹ *Adv. Prax. C. 25.*
C. 13.

² *Ib. C. 8.*
³ *Lib. 8. contr. Cel. p. 386.*

⁴ *De Trin.*
jections

jections over and over again: And we know too, or you ought to have known, that this your Answer has as often been refuted.* Not much above twenty Years ago I myself fully answered this very Objection, and before me † Dr. *Whitby*, † Dr. *Knight*, Bp. † *Bull*, and many others had done the same. In those Authors you will find it proved that by *Unity* is here to be understood, not only an *Unity* of Will, and Sentiment, but also of Nature. This the Context plainly shews. Thus, as you see, the most ancient Writers understood the Words: and thus the *Jews*, to whom our *Saviour* addressed his Discourse, understood him—*They took up Stones to stone him.* And they accused him of *Blasphemy*, because he being (as they thought) a *Man*, made himself *God*.

Another plain Proof of our *Lords* Divinity we have in the first Chapter of St. *Paul's* Epistle to the *Colossians*, where we read that † *our Lord is the Image of the invisible God, the First-born of every Creature. For by him were all things created, that are in Heaven, and that are in Earth, visible and invisible, whether they be Thrones, or Dominions, or Principalities, or*

* Vindic. P. ii. p. 44.

† Trin. p. 175.

‡ Col. i. 15. &c.

* Annot. y True Script. Doct.

† Jud. Eccl. Cathol. C. vi. S. 5.

Powers: all things were created by him, and for him. And he is before all things, and by him all things consist.—^b Dr. S. Clarke thinks it observable that St. Paul does not here call our Saviour—*πρωτόγονος πᾶνς κτίσας*—the first created of all Creatures, but—*πρωτόγονος πᾶνς κτίσας*—the first begotten before all Creatures, signifying in general that he was, before the Creation of things, *πᾶνς*—brought forth, produced by, derived from the Father.—And what words could more strongly set forth his Pre-existence to, and Pre-eminence above, all Creatures, even the highest Angels? He was before all things, all created Beings, and therefore himself uncreated. Creation is here ascribed to him in very full, clear, and expressive Terms. By him were all things created, not only this Earth, on which we dwell, but all things in Heaven, as well as Earth; not the visible World only, but all things visible and invisible, not only the Inhabitants of this Globe, but the very highest Orders

^b The like Interpretation is given by the ancient Fathers, *Justin Martyr*—*Γεννῆς ὑπὲρ γενεῶν πᾶνς ἑστίς, καὶ ὅς τις πᾶντων τῶν ἀνεργῶν.* Dial cum Tryph. p. 326. And again—*Ὁς καὶ ἀπὸ γενεῶν ἐστὶν ἑστίς, καὶ ὅς τις πάντων.* Apol. i. p. 96. And *Novatian*—*Quomodo omnis Creatura primogenitus esse potuit nisi quoniam secundum Divinitatem ante omnem Creaturam ex Patre Deo Sermo Processit.* De Trin. C. xvi. See *Waterland's Sermons*, p. 58. and *Whitby Annot.*

of Angels, or Archangels, whether they be Thrones or Dominions, Principalities, or Powers; they were all created—*δι' αὐτοῦ, καὶ εἰς αὐτόν*—by him and for him, He created all things: and for his Pleasure they are, and were created. And as he is before all things, so by him all things consist. He is not only the great Creator, but the perpetual Preserver, and Sustainer of the whole Universe. But this strong Proof of our Lord's Divinity you pass over very slightly. *You call it a magnificent Amplification, in which St. Paul has displayed his wonderful Dignity.—A magnificent Amplification indeed, to attribute all the Properties and Powers of God to a mere Creature! *Such Excellency of Speech this as St. Paul himself disclaims. It is indeed calculated to lead the plain Reader into the grossest Errors. But you think that all this Proof may be set aside by what St. Paul adds in the Close—*For it pleased the Father that in him should all Fullness dwell.*—All this Fullness, you say, all these Powers and Attributes depended on the Father's Pleasures: and therefore he is not the Supreme God.—This pitiful Sophistry (to use your own Language) concerning the Supremacy of God, which meets us in almost every Page, has, I hope been al-

* P. 43.

* 1 Cor. ii. 1.

ready sufficiently considered. We hold, as I have already told you, our *Lord* to be *the Son of God*, and as such deriving his Nature, and Attributes, from *the Father*. But we cannot allow that the Word *υδωκνος*—signifies arbitrary Will and Pleasure. We learn from this very Text that he was *begotten of his Father before all Creatures*. And therefore we esteem him to be *very God of very God; ' the Only begotten Son of God, who was in the Bosom of his Father from the Beginning; ' his beloved Son, in whom he is well pleased, and in whom he always was well pleased from all Eternity*. After all, this 19th Verse has no Relation to the pre-existent State of *Christ*. Our *Lord's* Pre-eminence above all Creatures is, though *magnificently*, yet truly, set forth in the 15th, 16th, and 17th Verses above quoted. Then follows at the 18th Verse—*And he is the Head of the Body, the Church: who is the Beginning, the First-born from the Dead, that in all things he might have the Pre-eminence*.—This plainly relates to his mediatorial Office. As God he was prior to, and above, every Creature. As Man, it pleased the Father to give him in this Respect in every thing the Priority, and Pre-eminence. As he

* Job. i. 18.

† Matt. iii. 17. εὐδωκνος.

was in his pre-existent State before all things, so, as Man, he was the Head of the Body the Church. As he was the First-born Son of God, begotten before all Creatures, so it pleased the Father that, as Man, he should be the first who should rise from the Dead, the First-begotten in every Sense. And to this latter State, and to this only, I apprehend the following Verse relates. And this will help to explain another Passage of Scripture, * which you find difficult to make Sense of, *Eph. i. 23.* The Apostle had been speaking before of Christ's Exaltation with regard to his mediatorial Office. At V. 22. he tells us that, *the Father hath put all things under his Feet, and gave him to be the Head over all things to the Church, which (he adds) is his Body, the Fullness of him that filleth all in all.* He who before as God, filled all in all, received, as Mediator between God and Man, a farther Completion, when God the Father gave him to be Head over all things to the Church. And much the same Interpretation Dr. Hammond gives us of it—*The Church, he says, which is the Body of Christ, and so is required to make him perfect in this relative Perfection—though, absolutely considered,*

* P. 164. * Hammond Annot. See another Interpretation given by Grotius, and Mr. Locke.

he is most exactly perfect of himself.—This, I think, makes very good Sense of this Passage, which appear to you so unintelligible in our Translation. And you give us another Interpretation of your own; which, as it is quite new, so I can make neither Sense, nor Grammar, of it.

But I must not pass by your curious Comment on Col. ii. 9. where you so wonderfully display your Criticism and Skill in the Greek Language. The Words are—*ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ κατοικοῖ πάν τὸ πληρῶμα τῆς θεότητος σωματικῶς*—Our unlearned Translators have rendered it—*For in him dwelleth all the Fulness of the Godhead bodily*.—But you have found out a new Sense for almost every Word.—*πληρῶμα*, you tell us, is that which is added, or put to, by way of making a thing compleat.—To this Mr. Fisher very properly answered that, though it might sometimes have that signification, yet the most plain and obvious Meaning was, as it is translated—*Fulness*, and he referred you to several Passages in Scripture, where it is used in this Sense. But, instead of making any just Reply, you treat him with the most unsufferable Insolence. * To tell you a Truth however, Criticism is to be understood only by those, who have made some Progress

* P. 58, &c.

* P. 164.

both in Grammar, and in the meaning of Words
 —And you repeat again your Assertion without any farther Proof, and without consulting the Passages referred to. An admirable Critick you, and well qualified to settle the Meaning of Words in Scripture, without ever consulting the different Passages, where they occur, or even deigning to look into them, when pointed out to you.

To no Answer there needs no Reply, but only—Look into your *New Testament*. Look too into your *Septuagint*, and you will find—*πληρωμα* always used in this Sense there. The next Word you take in Hand is—*θεότης*—which you would have signify the same as—*θεός*—But of this you have no other Proof, only that—*τὸ θεῖον* is used so by St. Paul, *Acts* xvii. 29. Admitting it thus to signify there, which yet is not very clear, the Words are by no means synonymous. *τὸ θεῖον* is an Adjective, and is used, I believe, by many Authors to signify the Divine Being, the Substantive being understood. The Word—*θειότης* or *θειότης*—is a Substantive, and signifies in the Abstract the divine Nature, or Essence, as—*ανθρώπιότης*—does the human Nature. It is used so, *Rom.* i. 20.—*ἡ αἰδὶς αὐτῆς δύναμις καὶ θειότης*—his eternal Power, and

and Godhead. Dr. Waterland has given us several Instances of the Words being so used by ecclesiastical Writers. You have not produced, and I doubt whether you can produce, a single Instance, of its ever being used to signify in the concrete *God himself*. But you tell us that *the first self-existent Cause could never communicate all, or any of, his own Nature to any Person whatsoever*. Here in the first Place, you beg the Question: in the next Place there is not a Word of *Communication* in the Text, but only in your fancied Interpretation of the Word—*πληρωμα*. The next Word you favour us with a new Interpretation of is—*σωματικῶς*—The Word—*σῶμα* you tell us is used by St. Paul, Rom. vii. 24. to signify a Collection of *many Causes*: and therefore—*σωματικῶς*—may signify—*collectively in one aggregate Sum*. I

Defence, p. 84, 394. As you understand *Greek* so well, and as I think it may help to explain the Passage before us, and may also shew you what Opinion the first *Christians* entertained of *Christ's Divinity*, I will give you an instance from *Melito*, a Writer of the 2d. Century. Τὰ 38 μὲν τὸ Βαπτίσμα καὶ Χριστὸν περιχρίσκει, καὶ μάλιστα τὰ σημεῖα, τὰ αὐτοῦ καρυμμένον ἐν σκεπῇ Θεοῦ ἐστίν, καὶ ἐπινοεῖται τῷ κόσμῳ. Θίξις 39 δὲ αὐτῶν καὶ καθάρσιον· τίλει· ὁ αὐτὸς, πᾶς δὲ νόσος ἐκλείπει ἡμῖν. Τὰ 40 Θεοῦ αὐτὸ 24 εἰς σημεῖον ἐν τῇ τριτῇ τῇ μετὰ τὸ Βαπτίσμα· τίτω δὲ Λιθωπετῆται ἐν ταῖς τεμένεσιν χρίναι τοὺς ἀπὸ τοῦ Βαπτίσματος. Εἰ οἱς 24 τὸ ἅπλως τὸ καὶ σῶμα ἀκίρῳσι τὰ σημεῖα τῆς αὐτοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ πᾶς Θίξις ἀληθὴς ὁ Θεὸς αὐτῶν ὑπάρχει. Ap. Cave Hist. Lit. Par. ii. P. 33.

signify.

would willingly accept of your Interpretation, if I could. That in *Christ dwelleth all the Fullness of the Godhead collectively* I hold to be very good Doctrine. But I cannot admit this new Sense of the Word without better Reason, or Authority. For, First—*σῶμα*—does not bear this Sense in the Passage referred to, *Rom. vii. 24*. Secondly, admitting the Substantive to signify a *Collection*, as it does in most Languages, it will not follow that the Adverb will signify—*collectively*—Try it in *English*. I have heard of a *Body of Law*, and a *Body of Divinity*: but I never yet heard of *Law*, or *Divinity*, dwelling in a *Man bodily*. You have not, nor can you, I believe, produce one Instance of the Word being so used by any Writer, sacred, or profane. All my *Lexicons* tell me that—*σωματικός*—signifies—*corporeus*—*belonging to a Body*: and—*σωματικῶς*—*corporaliter*—*according to, or after the manner of a Body*. Surely, Sir, you have no Reason to complain of Mr. Fisher for charging you with *torturing your Invention to put new Senses on Passages of Scripture*. And why did not you try your Skill too on the Word—*κατοικεῖ*—the only Word remaining, which has escaped your *Torture*: and a very strong Word it is. However at last you venture to translate. *For in him dwell, in one great*
Aggregate

Aggregate, all those glorious Gifts, and powerful Communications of God, which might compleat Him. And so the Apostle's most magnificent Amplification of the Godlike Actions, Powers, and Dignity, of the Son of God, ends in no more than what might be said of any good Christian. You own this to be no literal Translation: but you have the clearest Conviction that you have given the Apostle's meaning very exactly. And, if this Conviction could be increased, it would be by comparing this with another Text of St. Paul, Eph. iii. 19. that ye might be filled with all the Fullness of God. But I humbly apprehend that by the Fullness of God here, and the Fullness of Christ, Eph. iv. 13, is meant the Perfection of all Christian Graces and Virtues, which are called the Fullness of God, and of Christ, because we thereby obey the Commands, and follow the Example of God, and of Christ, or, if you will, because wrought in us by the gracious Assistance of God, and of Christ. As to the Sense of the Text, I think with Dr. Waterland that, we need not have Recourse to any remote and far-fetched Explications, when the natural and obvious, Construction of it is so near at hand. Whoever considers that the Logos, or Word, was made Flesh, or was God manifest in the Flesh,

will easily believe that that was the great Mystery which St. Paul had in his thoughts, when he told us that the Fullness of the Godhead dwelt in Christ bodily. And this is ushered in with a prefatory Caution against Philosophy, and vain Deceit, because the Mystery of God incarnate was what the Disputers of the World were most of all offended at, and what none of the Hereticks of the earliest Times would come into. The Docetae, a very early Sect, denied the Humanity of Christ, that they might still retain the Belief of his Divinity, while Cerintbus, and the Ebionites, denied his Divinity, that they might still acknowledge his Humanity, neither one, nor the other, admitting the Divinity and Humanity together, because such an Union of God and Man appeared utterly repugnant to their Philosophy. Both those Heresies probably had their Rise in the Apostles Times, and before St. Paul wrote this Epistle. In Opposition to both these, St. Paul teaches us that—
πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς θεότητος—the Fullness of the Godhead---the whole Divine Nature, dwelt in him, not only occasionally inspired, but took up his constant Residence in him. He who

^a See V. 2.

* *Iren.* L. iii. C. ii. Tertull. contr.

Marc. L. iii. C. 8. Novat. de Trin. C. 18.

L. iii. C. 3. 11.—*Eufr.* Hist. Eccles. L. iii. C. 27, 28.

was perfect God, assumed a Body, took Flesh upon him, or became incarnate. And thus the Fullness of the Godhead dwelt in him bodily. And this agrees well with what was said of him before, V. 3. that in him were hid all the Treasures of Wisdom and Knowledge. And in the same sense, the ancient Writers understood this Text.

But I had overlooked a detached Passage in your Letter, where we meet with another Specimen of your great Skill in Criticism. There you tell us that every Expression in the Original of Col. i. 16, 17, seems to be decisive of the Son's Inferiority; and censure Mr. B—— most unmercifully for his innumerable Blunders, and not rightly understanding the Greek Particles.—The Prepositions *ἐν*—and—*διὰ* never, you think, express primary independent Agency. Be pleased, Sir, to take your Greek Testament in Hand, and turn to Heb. ii. 10, where the Apostle speaks of God the Father—*ὁ ἐν τα πάντα, καὶ διὰ τα πάντα.*

The Letter of the Council of Antioch, which was held A. D. 263, is very full to the Purpose. — *ὁ ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς γεννητὸς καὶ ἐκ τῆς πατρὸς ὁμοούσιος καὶ ὁμοιότητος τῆς οὐσίας καὶ ἀμείωτος καὶ ἀχώριστος καὶ ὁμοτιμὸς τῷ πατρί.* Therefore also the Body born of the Virgin receiving all the Fullness of the Godhead bodily, is unchangeably united to the Godhead—in which Animate the same Jesus Christ is both God and Man. Ap. Labbe Concil. T. 1. P. 848.—See also Whistly Annot.

P. 96.

F

—Turn

—Turn again to *Rom. xi. 36.* where I suppose you will allow *the Father* to be spoken of, and where we read—ὅτι ἐξ αὐτοῦ, καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ, καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν τὰ πάντα—Again to *Acts xvii. 28.*—Ἐν αὐτῷ γὰρ ζῶμεν, καὶ κινῶμεθα, καὶ ἵσμεν—Or if you choose Classical Authors look into your *Lexicon*—Ἐν ἡμῖν—in me est—i. e. in mea potestate—Ap. *Dem. pro Cor.*—ἐν σοὶ ἵσμεν—abs te pendemus—Ap. *Sophocl.* ἐν σοὶ παρ' ἐγὼ γινώσκωμαι—Id. *Ajax.*—And how came you to forget the strong Expression—καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν ἰντισαί—Is this too expressive of the *Agency of a Minister?* Every impartial Reader will observe that the same Expressions are here used, which are in other Parts of *Scripture* employed to set forth the *Sovereignty of the Supreme God.* And we may reasonably conclude that the Apostle used such Variety of Expressions to denote in the strongest Manner, and beyond Contradiction, the sovereign Power of the *Son.* But you tell us that to convey that *Idea indisputably, the Apostle must have used the Preposition—ἐν—or perhaps—δι'—*Would that have satisfied you?—No—you would have told us that these Prepositions as well as—*διὰ*—were frequently applied to the Prophets, the Apostles, and Angels, who certainly acted in a

* See *Waterland's Sermon on Job. i. 3. P. 58.*

ministerial Capacity. As to the Particle---*αὐτοῦ*---though it is not applied to Christ with regard to the Work of Creation, yet St. John prays for Grace, Mercy, and Peace---*ἵνα ὁ πατήρ ἡμῶν καὶ ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ*---From God the Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ.---And now, Sir, I beseech you to consider whether the Censures, which you so liberally, or rather illiberally, bestow on others, do not return on your own Head: whose Reputation is most like to suffer as a Scholar, and who is to be charged with innumerable Blunders, and Want of understanding the Force of the Greek Particles. Your Omission of one of the main Clauses in this Passage of St. Paul may affect your Character in a still more material Respect.

The very same Doctrine is taught, and I suppose too by the same Apostle, in the Epistle to the Hebrews, which Passage you have passed over too very slightly. There we read that God hath in these last Days spoken unto us by his Son, whom he hath appointed Heir of all things, by whom also he made the Worlds. I find that you construe this Phrase---*ἐπονομασθῆναι τῶν αἰώνων*---disposed the Ages.---And the same Con-

* 2 Job. 3.

* Heb. i. 2, &c.

* P. 47.

* Sequel, P. 486.

struction is given by Mr. L. * But this Device has been fully confuted by Dr. *Whitby* in his Annotations. It may be sufficient to add that ~~eternum~~--- signifies not to dispose, but to make; that though--- ~~eternum~~--- in the Plural may signify past Ages and Generations, it can never signify the particular State of things under the Gospel; lastly that the Apostle has explained his own meaning, *Heb. xi. 3.* where we read that the *Worlds*--- ~~eternum~~--- were framed by the Word of God. And these *Worlds*, or--- ~~eternum~~--- are said to be the things that are seen. Of these the Son is here said to be the Creator, as he is in the last-cited Passage, * and also in St. *John's* Gospel. And this is set forth in still more full, and express Terms, *V. 10.*--- *Thou, Lord, in the Beginning hast laid the Foundation of the Earth, and the Heavens are the Works of thine Hands.*--- But the Scripture always appropriates the Work of Creation to God alone. This I shall shew more fully hereafter, I shall at present confine myself to what we meet with in this very Epistle. The Apostle here gives the Pre-eminence to *Christ* above *Moses*, and tells us that he was counted worthy of more Glory than *Moses*,

* See also Mr. *Pierce* Annot.

* *Job. i. 9.*

* Chap. *iii. 9, &c.*

inasmuch as he who hath builded the House hath more Honour than the House. And in the next Verse he addeth--but he that build all things, is God. And Moses was faithful in all his House, as a Servant. But Christ is a Son over his own House. The Apostle goes on to speak of the Pre-eminence of the Son of God in very high Terms. He calls him--*ἀνὰ φῶς τῆς ἀληθείας* καὶ *καὶ φῶς τῆς ἀληθείας* αὐτοῦ--*ἀνὰ φῶς τῆς ἀληθείας* αὐτοῦ--a Ray of his Glory.--God is in Scripture called Light, the Son is Light of Light, a Ray of the divine Light, of the same Substance and Nature with the Luminary, from whence it proceeds, and always co-existing with it. And this Similitude, as has been before observed, is frequently used by the ancient Writers to explain how the Son is of the same Substance, and co-eternal, with the Father. καὶ *καὶ φῶς τῆς ἀληθείας* αὐτοῦ--the express Image of his Person, or rather Substance---as true a Copy of the Father, fully representing his Essence and Attributes, as the Impression answers, in every Point to the Seal. These are very high Expressions, too high surely to be spoken of any Creature. These Titles may be given to our Lord, either because he appeared to Mankind,

* 1 Joh. 1. 9.

* See above, P. 9.

The Apostle in speaking of the Pre-eminence of the Son above the *Angels*, and therefore it is most reasonable to interpret this of the Son. As *he made all things, so he upholds them by his own Power.* All things are subject to him, and obey his---*ipse*---his Command.---And this is the very same Doctrine that we were taught in the parallel Passage before-cited---*All things were created by him---and by him all things consist.*---In the following Verses the Apostle sets forth at large the Pre-eminence of our Lord above the *Angels.* He was *God's own Son:* they only *ministring Spirits.* And this Pre-eminence he had, not only after he had accomplished the Work of our Redemption, and was received up into Glory, but long before. * We read in the next Chapter that he was *made a little lower,* or rather, *for a short time lower, than the Angels.*---He was therefore before higher than the *Angels.* * He was the *first begotten Son of God,* before he was brought into the *World:* and therefore, as a Son, superior to all *ministring Spirits.* He in the Beginning laid the *Foundation of the Earth:* and was then far above all Creatures, *visible and invisible, whether in Heaven; or on Earth.* Since therefore our

* Heb. ii. 7. 9.

* Gen. i. 1.

* i. 6.

Lord is so far superior to all *Angels*, and since all created Spirits above the Rank of Men are, in common Language, and in Scripture, called *Angels*, it follows that our *Lord* is no Creature: he was *begotten*, not *made*. * You allow *Christ* to be a most stupendously glorious Being, transcendently the greatest of God's Ministers: yet he is still according to you, only a *ministring Spirit*. But the Apostle says a great deal more. He teaches us that he is, far above all *ministring Spirits*, the *Creator of the World*, *the Son of God*, whom all the *Angels* worshipped. Nay he calls him *God* in express Terms.---*Thy Throne, O God, is for ever and ever*.---" You are pleased indeed to translate the Words—*God is thy Throne for ever and ever*.—It is true that in grammatical Construction---i e.---may be understood either in the *Vocative*, or in the *Nominative*, Case. And, as the *Hebrew* Language has no *Vocative* Case, the like Ambiguity was there unavoidable. But I cannot make any Sense of the Passage in your Construction of the Words. How a *Throne* can signify the Support of a *Throne*, or the *Supreme God* said to be the *Throne* of a Creature I cannot understand. And the Context greatly confirms the Sense given

* P. 14.

† V. 6, 7.

" P. 108.

by our Translation. At v. 6. *all the Angels of God are called upon to worship the First-begotten:* and therefore we may reasonably suppose that he whom they worshipped is here called God. At V. 7. we read that *God maketh his Angels Spirits.* This 8th Verse sets forth the Pre-eminence of the Son above all these Spirits. *He is God, and his Throne is for ever and ever.* And in this Sense is this Passage understood by all the ancient Fathers. ^a *Irenæus* quotes this Text from the *Psalms*, and observes that *the Holy Spirit gives to both here the Title of God, to the Son who was anointed, and to the Father who anointed him.* And in the Beginning of this Chapter he says that, *the Holy Spirit never calls any one absolutely God, unless he were truly God.* What then have you to say to all this full Proof of our Lord's Divinity? You ask---*Is the Son equal to his God and Father, who rewarded him with this Pre-eminence for his Love of Righteousness, and Hatred of Iniquity, who thus commanded the Angels to worship him?*—The Answer to all here said is very plain from what has been often already observed. All who hold the

^a Adv. Hæres. L. iii. C. 6. The same says *Justin Martyr*, Dial. Tryph. p. 277.—*Tertull.* adv. Prax. C. 13.—*Cyprian* adv. Judeos L. ii. C. 6. *Origen* contra Cels. L. i. P. 43.

^{*} P. 108.

Divinity of the Son of God, and amongst the rest Athanasius himself, acknowledges the Son to be in some respects inferior to the Father, and particularly with regard to his mediatorial Office. As such he took upon him the Form of a Servant; and acted under the Father in a ministerial Capacity. We agree then that he who receives is inferior, in this Respect to him who gives, and he who is blessed to him who blesses. But will you say that he is therefore absolutely, and in every Respect, inferior? The contrary is evident. Bishops may bless Kings: and a King may accept a Commission from, and enter into the Service of another Prince, to whom he is, with regard to Nature, and Dignity, and in all other Respects, equal, or even superior. And it was only with regard to his human Nature, or his mediatorial Office, that our Lord is here said to be crowned with Glory and Honour. Be pleased, Sir, to read over this first Chapter, and there you will find, as I observed before, that the Son of God was infinitely superior to the Angels, not only before his Ascension, but before his Incarnation, as being the Son of God, the Creator of the Earth, and the Heavens, to which I may add from the Epistle to the Colossians— and all things therein, visible and invisible, whether they be Thrones, or Dominions, or Principalities,

Sitings, or Powers. Did the Father then command these ministering Spirits to worship the First-begotten, when he brought him into the World? And were they under no Command, no Obligation, to worship him before, who was the Only-begotten Son of God, the Brightest of his Glory, and the express Image of his Person? Were they not bound to worship, and adore him, from whom they received their Being, to whom they owed the Happiness, and Glory of their own angelick State. Yet, doubtless, when the First-begotten laid the Foundations of the Earth, the Morning Stars sang together, and all the Sons of God shouted for Joy, and every Creature paid Homage, and Adoration, to this their Creator. Look into the Psalm here quoted, and see who this is, whom the Angels are called on to worship, 'Jehovah; the Lord of the whole Earth, who is high above all the Earth, and exalted far above all Gods. And in the preceding Psalm the Psalmist, speaking of the same Person, tells us that 'all the Gods of the Nations are Idols, but Jehovah made the Heavens. And that the Angels worshipped him before his Incarnation appears by comparing Job. xii. 41. with Isaiah vi. 1. &c. St. John tells us that Isaiah saw his Glory,

1 Job. xxxviii. 7.

2 Psal. xcvi. 5, 9.

3 v. 5.

and spake of him: and *Isaiah* says that he, whose Glory he saw, was *Jehovah the Lord of Hosts*, and that the *Seraphims*, who attended his Throne, cried one to another, saying, *Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord of Hosts*. * You yourself allow him to have been, before he appeared in *Fashion as a Man*, the Representative of the Father's Glory. * As such he appeared in the *Tabernacle*, and *Temple*. You add that all spiritual Intelligences beheld him with distant Wonder. They did so: but the Scriptures say still more. * They teach us that twenty thousand, even thousands of Angels, attended him in the *Holy Place*. * Here he is described as sitting between, or above, the *Cherubims*: and here the Angels attended him, and gave Glory to him. When the Son of God became incarnate, this afforded new Matter of Praise and Adoration to these ministring Spirits. We read here that, when God brought his First-begotten Son into the World, he called on all his Angels to worship him. And accordingly we are told that * they gave Glory to God on his

* P. 94. * This is proved by Mr. Mead's Works, P. 343. A. Bp. *Tenison* on Idolatry. See also my Sermon on *Job. xii. 41*. * *Psal. lxxviii. 17*. * *1 Sam. iv. 4*. * *2 Sam. vi. 2*. * *2 Kings, xix. 15*. * *Psal. lxxx. 1*. * *xcix. 1*. * *Luk. ii. 13, 14*.

Birth; * they *ministred to him* in his State of Humiliation; † and attended on, and declared his *Resurrection*. Lastly, when our *Lord*, after his Resurrection, ascended up into Heaven, and *sat down on the Right Hand of the Majesty on high*, then again were all the *Angels of God* called on to worship him. * *There was a Name given him, which is above every Name, that at the Name of Jesus every Knee should bow of things in Heaven, and things in Earth, and things under the Earth, and that every Tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord to the Glory of God the Father.* For though we give *Glory to the Son*, that *Glory* tends to, and terminates in, the *Glory of God the Father*. We acknowledge him to be *the Son of God*, and to derive his Divine Attributes, and Essence, from *the Father*. Nor does the Honour, and Worship, paid to the *Son* any way interfere with, or derogate from, the Honour due to the *Father*, but on the contrary tends to his *Glory*. And accordingly we find Worship paid jointly to both. In the Book of the *Revelations* we read of Worship paid at the same time to both. * *The four Beasts, and the four and twenty Elders fell down before the Lamb,*

* *Matt. iv. 11. Luke—xxii. 43.*

* *Matt. xxviii.*

* *Phil. ii. 9. &c.* See Dr. *Waterland's* Sermon on this Text.

* *Apoc. v. 8.* See my Answer to *Lindsey*, p. 74. &c.

having

having every one of them Harps, and golden Vials full of Odours, which are the Prayers of Saints.— And the thousands of thousands of Angels round about the Throne, and the Beast and the Elders cried with a loud Voice, saying, *Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive Power, and Riches, and Wisdom, and Strength, and Honour, and Glory, and Blessing. And every Creature, which is in Heaven, and on the Earth, and under the Earth, and such as are in the Sea, and all that are in them, are represented as saying, Blessing, and Honour, and Glory, and Power, be unto him that sitteth upon the Throne, and unto the Lamb, for ever and ever. And the four Beasts, who represented the highest Order of Angels, said Amen.*

Another Text, which you controvert, is *Phil. ii. 6. &c.* where we read that *Christ Jesus being in the Form of God, thought it not Robbery to be equal with God: but made himself of no Reputation, and took upon him the Form of a Servant, and was made in the Likeness of Men.* Mr. B. had hereupon very justly argued, that —if the Words—the Form of a Servant, the Likeness of Men, and the Fashion of Man, signified to us that he Jesus Christ was actually a Man,

*the similar Expression---being in the Form of God
---must have a similar Interpretation, and signify
that he is actually God. To this plain, and con-
vincing Argument you answer not one Word,
but treat Mr. B. with your usual Insolence,
and tell him with the greatest Confidence that
this Text carries with it such evident proofs that
Jesus Christ is not the Supreme God, that you
could hardly conceive it possible for the most negli-
gent Reader not to see them. And then you mis-
represent Mr. B. and endeavour to make him
talk Nonsense, and give us a learned Dissertation
on the Word ἀπαρμέν, whereas to this Clause
Mr. B. had said nothing: You treat Mr. B.
with the like Contempt. He had given you his
Reasons why he could not admit of your Inter-
pretation of this Text: but all the Answer you
vouchsafe him is, that he little understands
your very serious Discussion of this Text, that the
whole he has said is mere Sophistry, and that there
is one little Word—ἀλλα—which infallibly de-
monstrates our present Translation to be inadmissi-
ble.—Let us then see what Reason you have for
this amazing Confidence. First then the Non-
sense is your own creating. We are not obliged
to accept either Part of your curious Dilemma.*

Why may we not construe the latter Clause as exegetick of the first? Suppose then we understand the Words thus—*Who being the Son of God, and as such rightfully, and really, equal with God, &c.*—this, if not the true Interpretation, is at least good Sense. After some little Descant, which I can call by no other Name than your own—mere *Sophistry*—you abuse Mr. B. for asserting that *God was made Man* (the *Supreme God* are not Mr. B's Words, but your own Addition) which is no more than *St. John*, as well as *St. Paul*, has taught him to say. And you proceed to throw out most indecent Reflections on our *established Forms, and Creeds*, as requiring the *Belief of the strangest Medley of Contradictions*. This is your decent Language, and your *very serious Discussion*. I believe you are the very first Person, who has spied out a *Contradiction* in these Articles in our two *Creeds*. The *Nicene Creed* asserts that *Christ was made Man*, which I suppose you will agree to. The *Athanasian Creed* asserts the same. But whereas some *Hereticks* had advanced strange Doctrines concerning this *Incarnation*, it was thought proper to guard against their Sub-

^a P. 90, &c.

^b *Job*. i. 14.

^c *1 Tim.* iii. 16.

^d See Dr. *Waterland's* Comment.—Dr. *Horbery's* Sermon on *1 Tim.* iii. 9.

tletics by a farther Explication. The *Apollinarians* confounded the two Natures in *Christ*: and therefore in Opposition to them it was added that he was *one Christ*, not by *Conversion of the Godhead into Flesh*. He did not change his *divine Nature*, or convert it into *Flesh*, though he be said to have been *made Flesh*. He took *Flesh* upon him, he assumed human Nature, took *Man* into Union with *God*, and thus was he *one Christ*. I cannot see the least Appearance of *Contradiction* between the two *Creeeds*. The *Nicene Creed* does not say that *the Godhead was converted into Flesh*, but that he, who was *very God of very God*, was *made Man*. If you think this incredible, be pleased to explain how your—*Θεός*—who was *next to the Supreme God the most glorious Being in the Universe*, was *made in the Likeness of Men*: and then it will be Time enough to answer you farther.

As to the Clause—*ἐκ ἀπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ*—our Translation is supported by all the ancient Versions: and, though some have interpreted it differently, it has been generally so understood, not only by most Writers since the Council of *Nice*, but before by *Tertullian*, and *Clemens Alexandrinus*. And it is most agreeable to the Import of the *Greek Words*. The proper Signification of the Word—*ἀπαγμός*—is

H

Robbery

Robbery—and—*ἵνα ἴσα ὦν*—admits of no Construction so naturally as this—to be equal with God.—The chief Objection you have against this is from the Particle *ἀλλὰ*—following after. But I wonder you should not know that this Particle is often used, ¹ and particularly in the sacred Writings for—*ἀλλ' ὅμως*—and is translated—*nevertheless*—*howbeit*—*notwithstanding*.—And yet this little Word you think will infallibly demonstrate to unprejudiced Men of real Learning our present Translation to be inadmissible. I really, Sir, dare not be so confident, nor do I pretend to infallible Demonstration. ² But I can refer you to some Men of at least as good Learning as yourself, and such as we may expect a proper Elucidation of difficult Scripture from, who have ably supported the Sense given by our Translation. And I shall readily admit that this Clause is of difficult Construction, and is differently interpreted by learned, and able Criticks. Some have held it to relate to our Saviours pre-existent State, some to his subse-

¹ See 1 Cor. ix. 12.—Rom. v. 14.—Rev. ii. 20.—I could point out to you many more, if there were Occasion.

² Hammond Annot.—Pearson on the Creed, P. 121, &c.—Bull Prim. and Apost. Trad. C. vi. S. 21. Warren Conc. ad Cler. Waterland's Sermon on the Text. See also ad Defence. P. 222.

quent Humiliation. Take it in this latter Sense, if you please, put your own Interpretation upon it: let it signify that *he was not eager to retain his former Splendours*, yet you have not shewn us, what you so roundly asserted, what evident Proofs you had from hence that *Jesus Christ was not truly God*. On the contrary whatever Interpretation we put on this Clause, it appears clearly from the whole Passage, First that *Christ had a Pre-existence before his Incarnation*, and was then in the *Form of God*. This you allow: but Mr. Lindsey will have it to signify no more than the Power of working Miracles, &c. in which Sense *Moses*, and *Elijah*, and *St. Paul* himself, might be said to have been in the *Form of God*. But for a full Confutation I refer him to the Authors already cited, and to Dr. Clarke the very Writer he refers to, who not only calls it, but has proved it to be, a very unnatural Interpretation. Secondly, As in the next Verse his taking upon him the *Form of a Servant*, and being made in the *Likeness of Men*, signifies his becoming really a *Servant*, and being truly a *Man*, so his being in the *Form of God* ought in all reason to be understood to signify his being really and truly

God. ^a Lastly there is a Gradation in the Original not properly preserved in our Translation. The 7th Verse runs thus—*Αλλ' ἐαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν, μορφὴν δούλου λαβὼν ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος,* which may be thus literally rendered—*Nevertheless he emptied himself, taking the Form of a Servant, being made in the Likeness of Men.*—And this is agreeable also to the *Vulgate Latin* Translation. *He emptied himself*—he divested himself, not of *his Divinity* (that is your *Nonsense*, not ours) but of that *Glory, and Splendor*, in which he had appeared before his *Incarnation*.—*taking upon him the Form of a Servant*—and this he did by *being made in the Likeness of Men*.—The Word—*Servant*—does not then express the low Condition, in which he appeared on Earth : this is afterwards expressed in the next Verse.—*And being found in Fashion as a Man, he still farther humbled himself, &c. &c.* The Word *Servant* is plainly opposed to the Word *God*. He was before *in the Form of God*, and appeared in *Glory and Majesty*, attended by *his own and his Father's Angels*. But he divested himself of this *Glory*, and submitted to *take upon him the Form of a Servant*. He was therefore before no *Servant*, and conse-

^a See *Pearson* on the *Credo*, and other Authors above-cited.
quently

quently no Creature. For all Creatures are Servants of the most high God: * the Angels are all ministring Spirits, and the most glorious created Being in the Universe is no better than a Servant, and infinitely inferior to the Supreme Being. * But to the Son he saith—Thy Throne, O God, is for ever, and ever.

But you have a still more difficult Text to deal with, *Rom. ix. 5.*—*Of whom as concerning the Flesh Christ came, who is over all God blessed for ever.* You have attempted several different ways of explaining away this Proof of Christ's Divinity, which are all of them sufficiently answered by Mr. Fisher. But you neither attempt to justify any of your Constructions of the Text, nor give him any Answer to his Objections, but treat him with most contemptuous Insolence^o. You tell him that you have discussed the Text most seriously, and calmly; and that he has noticed your Reasons in such a way, that Scholars will inform him that his own Remarks, and Quotations, prove his Ignorance of the Point, on which the Argument turns.—A very magisterial Way this of dismissing what you cannot answer. You give us indeed a new Interpretation of the Text: but which of your several

* Heb. i. 14.

° Ib. v. 8.

° P. 162.

Expositions you will abide by you tell us not. I have already considered this Text *seriously*, and *fully*, in my *“Vindication of the Doctrine of the Trinity”*: and it has been handled at large by other abler Writers. But, as you have gone beyond all before you on this Subject, and as you treat Mr. *F.* with such Contempt, I will reconsider the matter, though I can add little, or nothing, to what has been already said. The Words before us, taken in their most plain and obvious Sense, not only in our Translation, but in the Original, set forth the true *Divinity of Christ*, in the strongest Terms—ἐξ ὧν ὁ Χριστὸς τὸ κατὰ σὰρκα, ὁ ὧν ἐπὶ πάντων Θεὸς εὐλογητὸς εἰς τὰς αἰῶνας, ἀμήν—The Words—ὁ ὧν—who is—plainly relate to the immediate Antecedent—Χριστὸς—Christ: and the Words—τὸ κατὰ σὰρκα—as concerning the *Flesh*—are a restrictive Clause, and require something in the Antithesis to answer them. They imply that, as *Christ* was of *Israel*, as to his *Human Nature*, so he had some other Nature, which was not of *Israel*: and therefore the Words following ought in all reason

¹ Part II. P. 16, &c. See also *Pearson* the Creed, P. 132, &c.—*Waterland*’s Sermons, P. 221, &c. *Stillington*’s Disc. on the Trinity, P. 153, &c.—*Grabe* Answer to *Whiston*, P. 23, &c.—*Conant*’s Serms. Vol. vi. Sermon 8. *Hammond* and *W’bithy* Annot.

to be understood as declaring what that Nature is. 'As the *Apostle* tells the *Jews* that *Christ*, as *Man*, was descended from them, so he thought it necessary to put them in mind that he was not only *Man*, but *God* over all blessed for ever. If we thus apply the Words to *Christ*, the Sense is easy, and the Construction natural. This cannot be said of any other Construction'.

'Dr. Clarke owns this to be the most obvious rendering of the Words. But then he tells us, First that the Word—~~who~~—is wanting in many MSS.

'I have already shewn that this Word is to be found in every MS, Version, and Citation, extant. And as this does not seem now to be pretended, I need not repeat what I have said. In the next place we are told that the *Greek Words* are of ambiguous Construction; and may signify, either—Of whom *Christ* came: *God*, who is over all, be blessed for ever—or—Of whom *Christ* came, who is over all: *God* be blessed for ever.—' One of these you seem to adopt, and accuse Mr. B. of Unfairness, in not giving his Reasons why this Translation could not be justified. If Mr. B. did not think it necessary to answer

* There is such another Antithesis, *Rom.* i. 3. See *Hammond's* Doct., Annot. See also *1 Tim.* iii. 16.—*1 Pet.* iii. 18.

* Script. Doct. Trin. N°. 538.

* See also *Mill.* Nov.

Test.—*Pearson* and *Stillingfleet* as above.

*P. 46.

swered

all Objections, you might have found them answered by the Authors above-cited. But, to repeat what I have already said, let me tell you that the Words—*ὁ αὐτός*—plainly refer to the Antecedent *Christ*, and cannot without force be applied to what follows. In the second of the above Constructions the Article before—*οὗτος*—is wanting. If it had been the *Apostles* Design to separate the two latter Clauses, he surely would have said—*ὁ οὗτος*—This would have been quite necessary to prevent Ambiguity. In both these Constructions the Antithesis is quite lost: the Expression—*τὸ κατὰ σὰρκα*—as concerning the *Flesh*—has nothing to answer it. Words are applied to *God the Father* who has never been mentioned before in the whole Chapter: and a Doxology to him brought in very abruptly, without any visible Necessity, or Reason. For what could occasion the *Apostle* to break out into this sudden Exclamation? What is it, which he is here supposed to bless *God* for? not for the *Gospel of Christ*; not for our Redemption or Salvation by him, but because *Christ descended of Israel, as concerning the Flesh*. Lastly, the same Construction is put upon this Passage by all the ancient Writers, as well before, as since the *Council of Nice*, who alledge this

Text as a Proof of our Lord's Divinity. * *Irenæus, Tertullian, Novatian, Cyprian, Origen, Hippolytus, and the Council of Antioch.*

What then are your Objections against this Construction? * *First*, you tell us that *this is the only Passage of the whole Scriptures, where this, or a similar Title, is given to the Son.* What do you mean? You yourself allow that the Son is in several Places called---Θεός---or *God*---though you would expunge the Word, whenever you have the least Pretence for it. The Phrase---*who is over all*---Mr. Locke joins with the Antecedent—*Christ*—⁷ and so do you yourself. * And in the very next Chapter the *Apostle* calls him *Lord over all, rich unto all that call upon him.* The same *Apostle* in other Places teaches us that * *he is the Head of all Principality and Power*; ⁸ and that *he is before all things, and by him all things consist.* And our Lord says of himself—* *He that cometh from Heaven is above all.* I do not indeed remember that the Title—*εὐλογητὸς*—is in any other Place expressly given to the Son. * But St. *John* tells us in his Book of the Revelations that he beheld, and heard

* See the References in Dr. Milles's N. T. See also *Waterland*, and *Grabe*, as above-cited, and *Bull. Def. Fid. Nic. Sect.*
 il. C. 5 * P. 49. 7 P. 163. * *Rom. x. 12.*
 * *Col. ii. 10.* 8 i. 17. * *Job. iii. 31.* * *Rev. v. 12, 13.*

*the Voice of many Angels round about the Throne, &c. saying with a loud Voice—Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive Power, and Riches, and Wisdom, and Strength, and Honour, and Glory, and Blessing—εὐλογίαν—And every Creature—heard be saying—Blessing—ἡ εὐλογία, —and Honour, and Glory, and Power, be unto him that sitteth upon the Throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever. And the four Beasts said Amen. The like Doxology we have again, Rev. vii. 12. Justly therefore may our Lord be styled---εὐλογητὸς εἰς τὰς αἰῶνας Ἀμήν---blessed, and worthy to be blessed. Amen. * Again, you object to the very peculiar Phraseology. The Participle---ὦν---you think, is utterly unnecessary, an useless load upon the Sense, and probably would not have been used by so elegant a Writer as St. Paul. But it happens that this very Phraseology is used by the same St. Paul, 2 Cor. xi. 31.---ὁ ὦν εὐλογητὸς εἰς τὰς αἰῶνας---And what amounts to the same thing---Rom. xi. 25.---ὃς ἐστὶν εὐλογητὸς εἰς τὰς αἰῶνας.---But who are you arguing against? not us, who understand the whole Clause of *Christ*. We think the Participle---ὦν---is so far from being redundant, that it necessarily determines the Sense.---ὁ ὦν---who is---plainly refers us to*

what went before---*Christ*---as in the Texts above-cited---ὁ αὐτός---and---ὁς ἐστίν---refer us to the Antecedent---*God the Father*---And therefore I must take the Liberty to return back to you your Compliment to Mr. F.---*Your own Remarks and Quotations prove your Ignorance of the Point, on which the Argument turns, and consequently that you are no Judge in the Case.*

But you have another Evasion, whereby you would get rid of this hard Text, which is, I believe, quite peculiar to yourself. You would transpose the Words, and read the---αὐτός---with an Aspirate: and then the Text would stand thus---ὁ αὐτὸς ἐστὶν πάντων Θεός---But for this you have no Authority whatsoever, from any MS. Version, or Citation. Nay it has appeared that the earliest Writers read the Words in the same manner that we do. But what is worse, it makes downright Nonsense of the Text.---The *Apostle* had said just before---*Who are Israelites, to whom pertaineth the Adoption, and the Glory, and the Covenants, &c.* And therefore to add immediately afterwards---*whose is the God that ruleth all*---seems to be a vain Repetition. But if any thing more strong and sublime is intended, what can it be? The *Apostle* had asked before---*Is he the God of the Jews only?*

¹ Rom. iii. 29.

is he not also of the Gentiles? Yes of the Gentiles also.---Nay it was the chief Design of this Epistle to enforce this Doctrine. And yet you make him here reckon it as a Privilege of the *Israelites*, that *theirs was the Supreme God*. Such is your Skill in *Criticism*. When I find so many different Evasions tried, and to so little Purpose, I cannot but look with Concern on the great Distress, which all those must be driven to, who study to set aside the obvious Meaning of so plain a Text.

But you, Sir, are never distressed. You can *put a rational, and Unitarian Sense*, upon any Words whatsoever. If *Christ is called God in the Scriptures*, though in the most emphatical Manner, he is only called so in a *secondary, or subordinate, Sense*. The *Angel, who spake to Moses in the Bush*, is called *God*: *and so he was, the Angel Jehovah, the Son of God himself*, But *Moses was made a God to Pharaoh, and Princes are called Gods*. And why did not you add *the Devil too*? Mr. *Fisher* has fully answered this Objection, to which you deign not to make any Reply. It is indeed an old Ob-

^a See P. 46.
and Authorities there cited.

^b See my Answer to Mr. L. P. 11. &c.

^c 2 Cor. iv. 4.

jection,

jection, * and has been often answered. In all the Instances, which you have produced, or can produce, where any Creatures are called *Gods*, it is with such expresse Limitations and Restrictions, as shew plainly that they are called so in an improper, or inferior, Sense.—¹ *The Lord said unto Moses, See, I have made, or rather I have given, thee as a God unto Pharaoh.* The Meaning is plain, *Moses* was, as we read in ^m another Place, *instead of God*, both to *Pharaoh*, and to his Brother *Aaron*. He was *God's* Ambassador, appointed to speak to them in his Nameⁿ. *I have said—Ye are Gods*—says the *Psalmist* of Magistrates. But then he adds—*Ye shall die like Men*. Nor can you produce one Instance out of *Scripture*, where any Creature is in the singular Number absolutely called *God* without any Limitation. But since you are pleased to call us *Athanasians*, I will give you the Authority of an ancient Father, *Irenaeus*, who lived in the second Century, long before *Athanasius* was born, * who brings this very Text in proof of our *Lord's Divinity*. ^p And in another Place he tells us that *neither our Lord, nor the Holy*

* See in particular *Whitby* Annot. on *Job*. i. 1.—*Sherlock's* Scripture Proofs of our Saviour's Divinity, Sect. iii.

¹ *Exod.* vii. 1. See *Patrick's* Annot.

^m *iv.* 16.

ⁿ *Psal.* lxxxii. 6, 7.

^p *Lib.* lii, C. 18.

^p *Ib.* C. 6.

Ghost,

Ghost, nor the Apostles, ever called any Person definitively, and absolutely God, who was not truly God, nor any one Lord in his own Person, but him who governed all things, God the Father, and his Son.—And again—If the Scripture calls those Gods who are not so, it is never without some Addition, by which they are shewn not to be really Gods.—But Christ is called God here absolutely, and that in the most emphatical manner, with Addition of some other Titles peculiar to the true God---who is over all God blessed for ever.

But even this will not satisfy you: you are determined to dispute every Inch of Ground. and (for once to address you in your own polite Language) you have as many Shifts, as a weather-beaten Fox. If Christ is God, he is so only in an inferior, or qualified Sense; if he is God over all, it is because God hath appointed him Heir over all things; if he is blessed for ever, it is only as long as the Ages shall continue, to the End of the World. And this Sense you think yourself entitled to put upon the Words from 1 Cor. xv. 24, &c. where Christ is represented as delivering up his Kingdom to God the Father at the End of the World. But the whole Context plainly shews that the Apostle is there speaking of Christ in his mediatorial Capacity. He seems to speak of him under the

the

the Figure of a Lieutenant, or General, who is sent out with a Commission to bring Enemies, or Rebels, into Subjection. He is here represented as having executed his Commission, *put down all Rule, and all Authority, and Power, and put all Enemies under his Feet*, and then giving up his Commission, and *delivering up the Kingdom to God, even the Father*. And to shew that no Power shall remain opposite to that of God, the *Apostle* adds that *the Son also himself shall be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all*. But how shall he be subject? as a Son to the Father, acting always agreeably to his Will, and having no Power but what is included in that of the Father, but *glorified with the Father with the Glory which he had with him before the World was*. And what shall he deliver up? his Kingdom, or mediatorial Office, or rather only such Parts of it, as shall then have received their Accomplishment, when *all Enemies are put under his Feet*. For we read in other Parts of Scripture that *of his Kingdom there shall be no End*, that *his Dominion is an everlasting Dominion*, that *his Throne is for ever, and ever*, and that *he shall reign*

^a Job. xvii. 5.

^b Luk. i. 33.

^c Dan. vii. 14.

^d Heb. i. 8.

^e Rev. xi. 15.

for ever and ever. And this is the Sense given to the Place by all the "best Commentators. But you would Interpret---*eis τὸς αἰῶνας*---to signify---*to the End or Consummation of the Age,* as long as the World shall continue. The Word---*Αἰών*---often signifies some particular Age: and in the Plural---*Αἰῶνες*---is put for Ages past. But the Phrase---*eis τοὺς αἰῶνας*---always in *Scripture* signifies *Eternity*, and is rendered in our Translation---*for ever.* I know of no one Instance to the contrary. It is the Phrase commonly used to express the *Eternity* of the *Supreme Being.* This very Title of---*Εὐλογητὸς*---or---*Εὐλογητὸς eis τὸς αἰῶνας* is in several Places given to *God the Father.* And how inconsistent are you with yourself? You here tells us that all this *may be true of Jesus Christ,* and yet in the very next Page you find it necessary to make a Transposition of the Words, because *no such Title is in Scripture given to the Son.* I wish too you would seriously consider whether it is not a great Injury to the sacred Writers, to charge them with such an ambiguous, and loose way of speaking, especially in a Point of such Importance. If *Christ* were

* *Grotius Hammond, Whitby, Pol. Synopf. Pearson on the Creed, P. 152.*

* *Mar. xiv. 61.—Rom. v. 25.—*

2 Cor. xi. 31.

not truly God can we suppose that any inspired Writer would so place his Words, as to lead the unwary Reader to imagine that the most incommunicable Titles, and Attributes of God, belonged to him, or can we suppose that St. Paul, a Writer of a warm, but regulated Imagination, and great Address, would speak in such magnificent Terms of Christ, if he were only a Creature; that he should not only call him God, but ---God above all, the same Title, which the Gentiles gave to the Supreme God, * and which he himself uses to express the Supremacy of the Father himself; that he should also add the Title of Blessed for ever, which is of itself used to signify the Supreme God, * and was the very Form itself used by the Jews, when they paid their Adorations to the God of Israel? * Can we, I say, suppose that St. Paul should write to the Christians at Rome, most of whom were then converted Jews, or Profelytes, and give such Titles as these to Christ, if he had not intended that they should believe him to be the same God, whom they had always in that Manner, and under that Form, ador'd; or that he, who

† Eph. iv. 6. * See 1 Chron. xvi. 36.—xxix. 10.—Neb. ix. 6.—Psal. xli. 13.—lxxii. 18, 19.—lxxxix. 52.—Pearson on the Creed, P. 133.—Hammond Annot.

* The Word—Amen—was also usually added in the Close of their Prayers and Doxologies to God Almighty.

was a Writer able to express himself properly, and intelligibly, should use such Expressions, as must naturally tend to lead, and actually has led, the Bulk of *Christians* into a dangerous and hurtful Error, and teach them to *worship and serve the Creature*, equally with the Creator. 'But you tell us that *this is the only Text in the Bible, which seems to say any thing for Athanasianism*: and therefore you, and your Friends, were under a *Necessity of interpreting it*, by some way or other, in a *Sense* agreeable to your pre-conceived Notions. *The only Text this*—it is indeed a very strong and full one: but it is one out of an hundred more, which convey the same Doctrine.

I shall therefore proceed to another, which is still more strong, and full, which we have in the Beginning of St. *John's Gospel*.—*In the Beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.*—'The Proof of our *Lord's Divinity* drawn from hence you treat with a Levity very unbecoming the Importance of the Subject. Your whole Argument is nothing but a Jingle on the Term—*Supreme God*. This is a Fallacy, which runs through your whole Book, 'and has already been sufficiently obviated. And who are you arguing against? Not the *Athanasians*, who

^a P. 50, 45.

^b P. 67.

^c See above, P. 4, &c.

worship one God in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity, neither confounding the Persons, nor dividing the Substance. We hold the Son to be very God of very God; not another God, but another Person, of the same Nature, Substance, and Godhead, with God the Father. Your Quibble has been confuted, by several able Writers, not only among the modern *Athanasians*, as you are pleased to call them, but by the *Ante-nicene* Fathers 1500 Years ago. As you understand Greek so well, I will give you some of them in the Margin. And it is quoted, and urged in Proof of our Lord's Divinity, by *Ignatius* who lived in the first Century, and by *Christian* Writers in every Age since. *Ignatius* calls our Lord

K 2

the

[^d By *Clement of Alexandria* — 'Εν τῷ ἀμφοῖ ὁ Θεὸς ὅν ἄνθρωπος — 'Εν ἀρχῇ ὁ Λόγος ὅν ἐν τῷ Θεῷ ὁ Θεὸς ὅν ὁ Λόγος — *Pædagog. Lib. i. C. 8. P. 113.* — By *Hippolytus* — Εἰ δὲ ὁ ὅν ὁ Λόγος — αὐτὸς ἐστὶν Θεὸς, Θεὸς ὁν, τὸ αὐτὸ φέρονται ὅν, τὸ αὐτὸ λέγειν Θεὸς; Ἀλλὰ μὴ ἐν τῷ Θεῷ, ἀλλ' ὁ ὅν, ἀποκρίνεται δὲ ὁν ἄνθρωπος. *adv. Noet. C. xiv. P. 15.* By *Tertullian*. — Qui si ipse Deus est secundum Johannem — Deus erat sermo, habes duos, alium dicentem ut fiat, alium facientem. Alium autem quomodo accipere debeas, jam professus sum, *Personæ*, non *Substantiæ*, nomine, ad distinctionem, non ad divisionem. Cæterum ubique teneo unam *Substantiam* in tribus coherentibus. *adv. Prax. C. xli.* — * Εἰς τοῦ Θεοῦ ὁ φωνηθὲν λόγος ὁ ὅν ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ Θεὸς αὐτοῦ ὁ ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ Λόγος αὐτοῦ. *Epist. ad Magn. 8. 8.* — † Εἰς τὸν αὐτὸν Θεόν, συμπνεῖται τὸ καὶ πνεῦμα ἁγίου, ὁ ὅν ὁ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀφ' αὐτοῦ ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ γινώσκοντες. Θεὸς καὶ ὁν Μωϋσῆς, καὶ ὁν Θεὸς. *Epist. ad Ephes. 8. 7.* See *Bull. Def. Fid.*

Nic.

the eternal Word of God: ^h And he tells the *Ephesians* that we have one *Physician*, who is *Flesh and Spirit*, made and unmade, being God in the *Flesh*, both of *Mary*, and of *God*.—^h And this Text has been so understood by the best Commentators, and urged by many modern Writers, as a full Proof of the *Eternity*, and *Divinity*, of the *Son of God*; and the true Sense of it maintained, and every one of your Exceptions against it fully answered. And yet you treat Mr. B. with the utmost Contempt, as if he had broached a ridiculous, and *childish Paradox* never heard of before, a Doctrine, which no Man of common Sense ever did, or could hold. I stand amazed at your Confidence. One would think you never read any Author, ancient, or modern, but only those of your own way of thinking. ⁱ I have myself in my *Vindication of the Doctrine of the Trinity*, published not many years ago, fully considered this Proof

Nic. Sect. ii. Cap. 2. N^o. 6. — Sect. iii. C. 1. N^o. 3. &c. — *Waterland's* 2d Def. P. 254. &c. See other ancient Fathers quoted in my *Vindici*. Pt. ii. p. 30.

^h *Grotius*, *Hammond*, *Whitby Annot.* — *Erasm.* Paraphr. *Bull. Jud. Eccles.* *Cathol.* Op. P. 294. &c. — *Tillotson's Sermons*, Vol. I. Fol. Serm. 43, &c, *Waterland* Serm. on *Job*. i. 1.—1st. Def. P. 66. &c.—2d Def. P. 178. &c.—Import. Doct. Trin. P. 254. &c.—*Vitringa* *Observ. Sacr.* L. v. C. 13. *Buddaus* *Eccles.* *Apost.* *Clagett* *Paraph.* ⁱ Pt. ii. P. 23, &c.

of our *Lord's Divinity*: it might be sufficient to refer you to that, or rather to those abler Writers referred to in the Margin, to which I might have added many more. But in order, if possible, to stop your vain Boasting, I will enter into a farther Consideration of the Passage before us, though I can add little, or nothing, to what has been said before.

We are here taught that the same Person here called *the Word* (* a Term well known to the *Jews* of those Times) who *was made Flesh and dwelt among us*, to whom *John bare Witness*, even *Jesus Christ*, *was in the Beginning with God, and was God*. That the *Evangelist* meant to teach us that he was properly, and truly *God*, is, I think, plain. First, because in the Clause immediately preceding the Term—*God*—signifies him who truly and properly is so—*The Word was with God*.—Now I cannot think that St. *John* would use the same Word in two such different Senses in the same Sentence, without some plain Marks of Distinctions Had he meant to teach us that *the Word* was only an *inferiour God*, he must, and would have added some such Words as—in a subordinate and

* See *Grætius* Annot. *Hammond* on *Luke* i. 25.—*Tillotson* Sermon, 43.—*Allix* Judgment of the *Jewish Church*, P. 121, &c.—P. 258, &c.

limited Sense—¹ as you find necessary to add to make the Words speak your Sense. Nor can I suppose that the *Evangelist* would use such Ambiguity of Expression, as must naturally tend to lead the plain *Christian* into a great and dangerous Mistake, and that in a Point of the highest Importance.

Secondly, This is the usual, and proper Sense of the Word—*God*. This Term naturally conveys to us the Idea of an eternal, and unchangeable, Being, infinite in Wisdom, and Power. And this is also the *Scripture* Sense of the Word *God*. ^m The *Scripture*, as I observed, and proved, under the last Article, whenever they speak of *God* absolutely, mean thereby a Being of all possible Perfections, the Creator, and Governor, of the Universe. What then can we suppose that St. *John* could mean, when he tells us that *the Word was God*, but that he was truly and really *God*? especially as this is not an Expression dropped accidentally, but placed here in the very Beginning of his *Gospel*, where he purposely sets himself to declare, who, and what, the Person was, who *was made Flesh, and dwelt among us*, and whose Actions on Earth he was about to relate; and to cor-

¹ P. 70.^m P. 66.

rect the Mistakes, which some had run into with regard to his Existence and Nature. Here then, if any where, we must suppose the *Evan-
gelist* to speak properly, and explicitly. And therefore, if there are some few Passages in this *Gospel*, which seem to speak of the *Son* as in some Sense inferior to the *Father*, they ought in all Reason to be explained by this, and supposed to mean an inferiority in some other respect, and not in respect of his Nature and Essence.

Thirdly, In the Words immediately following *the Word* is in the most express Terms declared to be the *Creator* of the Universe—*All things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made that was made.*—^a But the *Scriptures* every where appropriate the Work of *Creation* to *God* alone, and represent it as the certain Mark, and Criterion, of the *true God*. —^b *Thus saith the Lord, thy Redeemer, and he that formed thee from the Womb—I am the Lord that maketh all things, that stretcheth forth the Heavens alone, that spreadeth abroad the Earth by myself*—Thus *Hezekiah* prayed before *Jehovah*

^a See *Waterland's* Serm. iii. on *Job*. i. 3.—*Allix* Judgment of the *Jewish Church*, P. 193.—*My Vindication* Pt. 1. 12.—

^b *Is.* xlv. 4.

—*O Jehovah God of Israel, which dwellest between the Cherubims, thou art the God, even thou alone, of all the Kingdoms of the Earth, thou hast made Heaven, and Earth.*—Lastly, ¹ St. Paul assures us that the invisible things of God are clearly seen from the Creation of the World, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal Power and Godhead: and therefore pronounces those without Excuse, who worshipped and served the Creature—*παρὰ τὴν κτίσιν*—over and above the Creator.—If therefore we could suppose any Ambiguity in the Word God, yet what follows here clearly determines the Sense, and shews him to be the same God, who in the Beginning created the Heaven, and the Earth. And from hence arises a full Proof of his eternal Power and Godhead. We may farther observe the great Care, which the Evangelist has taken to distinguish the Son from all Creatures. He does not say—all other things were made by him—but—all things—absolutely: and to preclude all Evasion, he adds that not any one thing that was made was made without him—*χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο ἂν ἂν ὁ γέγονεν*,—He therefore himself was not made, and therefore is no Creature, but

² 2 Kings xix. 15. See also *I/. xl. 25, 26.*—*xlj. 5.*—*xlv. 12.*—*Jer. x. 11, 12.*—*Job. xxvi. 7. &c.*—*Psal. xix. 1.*—*xxxix. 11, 12.*—*xcvi. 4, 5.* ¹ *Rom. i. 20. 25.*

the great *Creator* of all things. And the same Doctrine we have already seen taught in the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, and in that to the *Colossians*. St. Paul agrees exactly with St. John: and the two Passages explain, and confirm, each other.—'By him (says St. Paul) were all things created that are in Heaven, and that are in Earth, visible, and invisible, whether they be Thrones, or Dominions, Principalities, or Powers: all things were created by him, and for him. Farther, the Manner in which St. John here expresses himself is remarkable—*ἦν ὁ Λόγος*—All Creatures were made by him—*παντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο*—but in the Beginning was the Word—*Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ Λόγος*—he himself existed before all Creation.

Lastly, what still farther confirms our Interpretation of this Text is, 'that we are assured by the primitive Writers that there were in those very Times, when this Gospel was wrote, *Hereticks*, who denied the Divinity of our Saviour. And we are told by 'Jerom, and

' Col. i. 16. ' Iren. L. iii. C. 3. 11.—Tertull. Prescript adv. Hæret. 33. 48.—Euseb. Hist. Eccl. L. iii. C. 28.
' Prolog. ad Comment. in Matt. ' In Apocahys. Bibl. P. P. Tom. i. P. 1042. Victorinus flourished in the 3d Century: but the Genuineness of this Piece is doubted of by some.

* *Victorinus*, and * *Epiphanius*, and also by * *Irenaeus*, who lived very near the Times of the *Apostles*, that St. *John* wrote his *Gospel* on purpose to guard against the Errors of these *Antichristian Deceivers*. The same * *Irenaeus* observes that St. *John* here designed to give us a Rule of Faith, and to condemn all erroneous Opinions concerning the Person of our *Blessed Saviour*, and then immediately quotes the first Verses of this *Gospel*. * And we find all the Expressions here used by St. *John* perfectly agreeing thereto. * These *Hereticks* supposed a Number of inferior *Deities*, first the *Monogenes*, then the *Logos*. In Opposition to this St. *John* here teaches us that the *Logos* existed in the *Beginning*, before all *Creatures*, that he was not inferior to, or separated from God, but was in the *Beginning with God*, and that he was God; not a mere Man, * as the *Ebionites* held *Jesus* to be, nor a *Creature*, as *Cerintus* maintained of *Christ* or the *Word*, but truly God. * And whereas *Cerintus* held that the World was

* *Heret. ii. 2. P. 423.*

* *Lib. iii. C. 11. See the*

Passages quoted at length by Dr. *Waterland* Import. Doct. Trin. P. 250, &c.—See also my *Vindic. Pt. ii. P. 25.*—*Buddaeus Eccl. Apol. P. 412. 419.*—*Bull Jud. Eccl. Cathol. Cap. ii.*

* *Ib.*

* See this set forth at large by Dr. *Waterland*, *Ib. 254, &c.* and by Bp. *Bull*, *Vitringa*, and *Buddaeus*.

* *Iren. L. i. C. 1.*

* *L. iii. C. 11.*

* *L. i. c. 26.*

created by ſome inferior Deity, or Angel, we are here taught that *all things were made by the Word.* * And whereas ſome of theſe Hereticks pretended that this viſible World was made by one of their *Aëons*, or Deities, and inviſible things by another. St. John adds—and without him was not any thing made that was made. And to the ſame purpoſe ſpeaks St. Paul in the Place above-cited. The Evangelift farther adds—He was in the World, and the World was made by him—and—He came unto his own. Again, † whereas theſe Hereticks had their Genealogies of different Deities, the Monogenes, the Logos, Zor, &c. St. John teaches us that there is no other but the Son of God himſelf, in whom was Life, and who was the Only-begotten of the Father; who was in the Beginning with God, and who was God. † And the ſame Irenæus alſo tells us that his Epistles alſo are pointed againſt

* Ib. L. v. C. 18.—L. iii. C. 11. * Ib. L. i. C. 20. &c.
† L. i. C. 1. 5.—L. ii. C. 19. See alſo L. i. C. i. S. 19. where he confutes theſe Hereticks from this Chapter of St. John. Theſe are probably the Genealogies St. Paul ſpeaks of 1 Tim. i. 4.—Tit. iii. 9. See Hammond Grotius. L. iii. C. 18. P. 242. See this fully proved by Dr. Waterland Import. P. 262, &c. See alſo my Vindic. Pt. II. P. 32. Bull ut ſuprà. To the ſame Purpoſe ſpeaks Tertullian—Johannes in Epistola eos maxime Antichriſtos vocat, qui Chriſtum negarent in carne veniſſe, et qui non putarent Jeſum eſſe Filium Dei: illud Marcion, hoc Hebion. vindicavit. Præſcript. adv. Hæret. C. 93.

these same *Hereticks*; that these were the *Deceivers*, and the *Antichrists*, whom he there censures, * who denied that *Jesus was the Son of God*, and confessed not that *Jesus Christ was come in the Flesh*. † We are told indeed by Mr. *Lindsey*, that in those days there were *Hereticks* called *Docetæ*, who held that *Jesus was Man in Appearance only, not in Reality*. But the learned Author has not thought fit to tell us, what is equally true (as has been proved above) and what he might have learnt from the very Authors he quotes, that there were others in those Times, who denied our Lord's *Divinity*. Does *Ignatius* censure these *Docetæ*? the same Dr. *Wake* from whom he takes his Quotation, if he had looked into his Index, would have referred him to Places in these same Epistles, where *Ignatius* freely censures those who denied our † Lord's *Divinity*, and asserts his *Pre-existence*, his *Eternity*, and *divine Nature*. * And *Cotelerius*, another of his Authorities, says also the same. As to what he quotes from *Irenæus*, it is a most shameful Misquotation. The Title

* 1 *Job*. ii. 22.—iv. 3.—iv. 15.—v. 5.—2 *Job*. 7.

† *Lindsey* Apol. P. 155.

1 Epist. ad *Ephes*. C. 7. 18. 19.

—ad *Magnes*. 6. 8.—ad *Rom*. Inscript. C. 3.—ad *Smyrn*. C.

1. 3.—ad *Polycarp* C. 3. 8.

* Not. ad *Ignat*. ad

Magn. C. 8.

of the 18th Chapter of his third Book is not as he gives it us. It runs thus—*Ostensio quoniam unus et idem ipse Christus sit Verbum Dei.*—He refers you to Chap. xi. where he asserts that St. John wrote his Gospel to guard against the Errors of Cerintbus. And this whole Chapter is spent in confuting his Opinions, who divided Christ into two Persons, one a Man born of Joseph and Mary, the other a Spirit descending from above upon him at his Baptism, and leaving him at his Passion. In opposition to this Irenæus here teaches us that the same, who was the Word of God, the Only-begotten of the Father, our Saviour, our Lord, and our God, the Christ who is preached unto us, was incarnate, and the Son of God, was made the Son of Man.—And here he quotes St. John (as I observed before) and says that in this his Epistle he hath warned us to avoid those who taught contrary Doctrines, as Deceivers and Antichrists, and says that his Epistle agrees entirely with his Gospel, where he teaches us that the Word was made Flesh, and dwelt among us. And Irenæus concludes this Chapter thus—Jesus Christ the Son of God—was truly our Saviour: for he is the Word of God, he is the Only-begotten of the Father, Jesus Christ our God. Mr. Lindsey could not well have
picked

picked out a Passage of Antiquity pointed more directly against him.

The Title indeed of another Chapter, the 20th. is *Quæ causa fuit ut Verbum Dei caro fieret, et Adversus eos qui dicunt illum putative apparuisse*. But in this Chapter too Irenæus maintains that *Christ* was really *God*, as well as really *Man*. The *Word of God*, he says, which was in the Beginning, and always existed with the Father, was made a passible Man: and he shews that it was necessary that the Mediator between God and Man should himself partake of both Natures. And it is plain that St. *John* in this Epistle censures both those who denied *Christ* to be really Man, and those who denied him to be truly God. If he be supposed to point at the *Docetæ*, when he speaks of those, who confessed not that *Jesus Christ* was come in the *Flesh*, yet those *Docetæ* denied not, that *Jesus* was the Son of God. This those only did who denied his Divinity.

Now to return to you—^m Various Interpretations, you say, have been given to this Passage of St. *John's* Gospel by different Unitarians—Yes, and by the same too. ⁿ I think the celebrated

^m P. 68, &c.

ⁿ See my Vindication Part II. P. 27, &c.

Dr. Clarke has given us two or three. * You hold that *Jesus Christ was God in a subordinate, and limited Sense, dignified with this Title, because he was God's Vice-gerent in the Work of Creation.* Others suppose the Son to be here called God because he appeared in the Form of God in the Tabernacle and Temple. † Mr. Lindsey in his Apology takes no small Pains to prove that the *Word in the Beginning of this Gospel is wrongly applied to Christ, and is nothing but a Description, in the Hebrew way, of God himself.* ‡ But now he has found out that *Logos signifies Wisdom. Wisdom was with God—by Wisdom all things were made—and Wisdom was made Flesh, that is, the Wisdom of God resided in the Man Christ Jesus.* But you must excuse us, Sir, if we cannot give up the plain, and obvious, Sense of Scripture, only because the Wit of Man has been able, by far-fetched Interpretations, to affix a different Sense to the Words. On the contrary it greatly confirms us in our Faith, when we see what Perplexities, and Inconsistencies, all those must be driven to, who attempt to reconcile such Texts as this with any *Arian, or Socinian, Scheme.*

I have, I humbly think, shewn the *Impossibility, or at least the Improbability, of all these*

* P. 70.

† P. 88, &c.

‡ Sequel, P. 130. &c.

various Interpretations. However, to give you all the Satisfaction I am able, I shall consider what little you have to object. First then, you tell us that we read, *Exod. xxiv. 9, 10. that Moses, and the Elders of Israel, saw the God of Israel.* But this God of Israel could not be the Supreme God.—Not the Father, if you please. But I cannot but think it strange that any Christian, or any one that has ever read the *Old Testament*, should take it in his Head to deny that the God of Israel, was God Supreme. In the Text lately cited from the second Book of Kings, and in numberless others, we are taught that *the God of Israel, he is the God, even he alone, of all the Kingdoms of the Earth.* Not thirty Years ago the like Doctrine was advanced by the then Bp. of Clogher. In his *Essay on Spirit* he asserted that *the Being or Angel, who is called by Moses Jehovah, who had Israel assigned to him by the most High, as the Portion of his Inheritance, was a second Jehovah, inferior to the Father.* He was answered by several—*quorum pars parva fui.*— In my Answer I have shewn that the Person who appeared to Moses, and the Patriarchs was the Son of God, and that he was truly and really God. * And the same I have

* Pt. I. P. 49, &c.—See also Pt. III. P. 29, &c.

* P. 12. &c.

proved in my Answer to Mr. Lindsey. I beg leave to refer you to what I there said.

But you attempt to prove in contradiction to what is so frequently asserted in *Scripture*, that the God of Israel could not be Supreme God. For say you, we are assured by the *Apostles*, and by *Christ himself*, that no Man hath seen God at any Time, and therefore this visible God of Israel must be only some inferior God. The Objection is old, and the Answer easy. Be pleased, Sir, to consider that not only God, but all Angels and Spirits, are in their own Nature invisible. But we read in *Scripture*, that Angels have sometimes assumed visible Forms, and appeared in the Likeness of Men. And the same *Scriptures* inform us that the Son of God has done the same. This we never read of the Father. And in this Respect he alone is called invisible, both in the *Scriptures*, and ancient Writers, in Contradistinction to the Son. We read that no Man hath seen God at any Time. But why did you suppress what immediately follows—the Only-begotten Son, which is in the Bosom of his Father, he hath declared him. These surely are too high Appellations for any Creature, and declare sufficiently that the Son,

Job. i. 18.

M

though

though personally distinct from the *Father*, is of the same Nature with him, *God of God*. What we say then is, that *God the Father* never assumed any *visible* Appearance. But he hath sent his *Only-begotten Son* to declare his Will: He appeared to *Moses* and the *Patriarchs* of old; and he in these latter Days was made *Flesh* and dwelt among us; and we beheld his *Glory*, the *Glory as of the Only-begotten of the Father*, of the same Nature, and Substance, with the *Father*. And therefore he is called in *Scripture* the *Image of the invisible God*, the *Brightness of his Glory*, and the *express Image of his Person*. And this is the constant Language and Doctrine of all Antiquity, as may be seen by consulting the Authors cited in the Margin. I shall instance only in one *Justin Martyr*, who tells us that it was not *God the Creator of the Universe*, (by which Title he distinguishes the *Father*) who said unto *Moses* that he was the *God of Abraham*, the *God of Isaac*, and the *God of Jacob*, but yet the Person so appearing was called *God* and *Lord*—and again—He is called an *Angel*,

* See this fully set forth, and this Objection obviated, by *Ep. Bull.* Def. *Pid. Nic.* Sect. i. C. 1.—Sect. iv. C. 3. An-
madv. in *G. Clarke*, Op. P. 277.—*Waterland* 1 Def. P. 28,
&c.—2d Def. P. 134, &c.

* Col. i. 15.

* *Heb.* i. 3.

* *Dial. cum Tryph.* P. 283.

M

but

but is really God.—And a little before he says of the same Person—He is called God, and is, and will be God.—In another Place he says that the Angel of God spake to Moses out of the Flame of Fire in the Bush, and said—I am that I am—the God of Abraham, &c. And this Person here called an Angel, he says, was not the Father, and Creator of the Universe, but the Word, the Son of God, * who being the First-begotten of God was also God.— And by this Expression—I am that I am—God (he says) signified to Moses his Eternity, this Phrase denoting the Time past, present, and to come.

Another Pretence you have is that the Word is here called simply—ὁὖς—without an Article; but in the precedent Clause the Word is dignified with a Mark of Pre-eminence—ὁ ὢν. And from hence you would infer that it cannot denote a Person of equal Power and Perfections, according to the fundamental Rules of the Greek Language. But pray, good Mr. Priscian, who understand Greek, and Grammar, so well, you hold, I suppose, Jesus Christ to have been truly and really Man. How then would you ex-

* ὁὖς καὶ ὢν, ὁ ὢν P. 281. * Apol. ii. P. 95, 96.

† Ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ ὢν.

‡ ὁ ὢν ὁ ὢν ὁ ὢν ὁ ὢν ὁ ὢν.

§ ὁ ὢν ὁ ὢν.

* Cohort ad Græc. P. 24.

press this in *Greek*—Χριστὸς ἦν ὁ ἄνθρωπος—or—
 Χριστὸς ἦν ἄνθρωπος—The like Diction is used by
 St. *John*—ὁ Λόγος αὐτὸς ἐγένετο—And in the same
 Sense he tells us—Θεὸς ἦν ὁ Λόγος—As *the Word*
 was truly *made Flesh*, so was he truly *God*.
 The Want of the Article determines—Θεὸς—to
 be the Predicate, and is the very Expression,
 which, according to the best Rules of Logick,
 as well as Grammar, should be used to signify
 what we understand by it. Nay, if the *Apos-*
tle had used the *Article*, it should seem to have
 carried an Impropriety with it. It would favour
 the Doctrine of *Sabellius* now revived by Mr.
Lindley, who held the *Son* to be one Person
 with the *Father*. But St. *John* has here with
 the greatest Plainness, and Propriety, delivered
 the true Doctrine, in Opposition both to *Sabel-*
lius, and *Arius*, that the *Son* is a distinct Person
 from the *Father*, but yet truly and really *God*,
 of the same divine Nature, and Essence with
 the *Father*—*The Word was with God, and the*
Word was God.—A Subordination, if you will,
 is implied in it, that of a *Son* to a *Father*, con-
 sistent with a Sameness and Equality of *Attri-*
butes and Perfections. But you appeal for the
Truth of your Observations to all competent
Masters of the Greek Language. Great is your
 Confidence, But let me tell you that this is
 a very

a very old Pretence, and has been always treated by Men of the best Learning with the greatest Contempt. ^b Bp. Pearson wonders how any one could imagine that the *Apostle* could speak of one kind of God in the second, and of another in the third Proposition, upon so poor a Ground as the want of an Article. ^c Dr. Waterland calls it a blind and dark Conjecture of the Use of Articles, concerning which we have no certain Rules, either for Scripture, or for any other Writings. And he has fully proved it so to be. For in the first Place God the Father is often in Scripture called God without an Article: three or four times in this very Chapter. ^d Nay where the Father is spoken of in Contradistinction to the Son, he is called—*ὁ θεός*—without an Article: ^e and that in the very Verse you here cite—*ὁ θεὸς ἰσχυρὸς ἰσότητος*. And Christ himself is in several Places called—*ὁ θεός*—with an Article, particularly in the Text above-cited, *Rom. ix. 5.*—*ὁ ὢν Ἰησοῦς μετὰ τὸν πατέρα θεός*: as also *Matt. i. 23.*—*Job. xx. 28.*—*Act. xx. 28.*—^f And Passages also in

^b Expof. of the Creed, P. 120. ^c Sermon on *Job. i. 1.* P. 28. See also his 1st Def. P. 67, &c.—2d Def. P. 182, &c.

^d See also *Rom. i. 4. 7.*—*1 Cor. i. 24.*—*2 Cor. i. 1. 2.*—*Eph. i. 1, 2.*—*Gal. iv. 7, 8.*—*Phil. ii. 11.*—*Col. i. 1.*

^e Comp. *Num. xxi. 5*, &c. with *1 Cor. x. 9.*—*If. xlv. 22, 23.* and *Rom. xiv. 11.*—*Phil. ii. 10.*

the *Old Testament*, where the Expression in the *Septuagint* is—ὁ Θεός—are applied to *Christ* in the *New Testament*. And, if we look into the Writings of the ancient Fathers, we shall find them often calling *Christ* God---ὁ Θεός---with an *Article*. I shall give you two or three Instances from *Ignatius*. He thus begins his Epistle to the Church of *Smyrna*---Δοξάζω Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ὁ Θεὸν---And he prefaces his Epistle to the *Ephesians* in this manner---ἐν θελήματι τοῦ Πατρὸς, καὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν---* And again in the same Epistle we read---ὁ γὰρ Θεὸς ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστὸς ἐκνοθεῖται ὑπὸ Μαρίας.---To these I shall add one or two from *Clemens of Alexandria*. † Speaking of *Christ* he says---οὗτος ἐστὶν ὁ Θεός, ὁ Λόγος---And in the next Chapter speaking of the *Father*, and *Son*, he says---Ἐν γὰρ ἁμφο, ὁ Θεός. And in Proof of this he quotes this very first Verse of *St. John's Gospel*. You must therefore either say that these ancient Writers were not so competent Masters of the *Greek Language* as you are, or that they held *Christ* to be really and truly *God*.

But we have still higher Authority than this, that of *St. John* himself, † who in the End of his first Epistle tells us that *Jesus Christ* is (with

* S. vii.

P. 113.

† Prædagog. L. i. C. vii. P. 110.

* Ch. v. 20.

† C. viii.

an *Article*)---ὁ ἀληθινὸς Θεὸς---the true God.---
 This Text you have passed very slightly over.
 ' First you quarrel with our Translation for *interpolating* (as you call it) the Word *ever*: and you translate the Particle---ἐν---by or through. But though this Particle may bear this Signification in other Places, this will not justify your translating the same Word differently in the same Sentence. If---ἐν τῷ ἀληθινῷ---just before signifies---in him that is true---surely---ἐν τῷ ὑἱ αὐτοῦ---ought to be rendered---in his Son.---
 And the Insertion of the Word---even---is proper to give the Sense more clearly in English. But you may translate this as you please: the Stress of the Point does not lay here. What we insist on is that the following Pronoun---ὁτός---this---naturally refers to the immediate Antecedent---Jesus Christ.---And if so---Jesus Christ is here expressly called the true God. But you would refer it to God the Father, who is mentioned a little before. ' But, though a Pronoun may sometimes refer to a remote Antecedent, yet it is not so usual, nor so natural, neither should it be presumed so to do without

h P. 71. ' See *Whitby Annot. Glassii Grammat. Sacr. Lib. iii. Tract. 2. P. 193. Pearson on the Creed, P. 132. Waterland's Sermon. P. 206. Sec. My Vindication, P. ii. P. 34. &c.*
 some

some good Reason given. But the only Reason you give is a Reference to *Job. xvii. 3.* where *the Father* is called---*the only true God.*¹---I have already shewn that this is not to be understood exclusively of the *Son.* ¹*Dr. Clarke* indeed tells us that *all the Ancients* understand this our Text of *God the Father.* But he has not produced one single Proof; nor can one, I believe, be produced. On the contrary we are assured by ²*Atbanasius* and by ³*Theodoret*, that this Text was urged against the *Arians* in the *Nicene Council*, and that they could not deny that these Words were spoken of the *Son*; but evaded them by saying that *Christ* was truly made *God*, and therefore was a *true God*; and that, to guard against such Evasions, the *Nicene Fathers* thought proper to make use of the Word---*consubstantial.* Besides, if we refer these Words to the Father, it is a mere Tautology, and makes the Apostle say that *the true God is the true God*: nor can any Sense be put upon the Words in this Construction, but what is very forced, and unnatural. Farther, the Words that follow---*ζωὴ αἰώνιος*---*eternal Life* shew that the whole is to be understood of

¹ See above P. 18, &c.

¹ Script. Doctr. N°. 410.

² Epist. ad Episcop. in *Africa*, P. 936.---Disput. contr. *Ar.* in Conc. Nic. P. 127.

³ Hist. Eccles. L. i. C. 8.

the Son. This Title of the Life, and of eternal Life, is commonly in St. John's Writings appropriated to the Son; nor is it ever, as I can remember, applied to the Father. * St. John in the Beginning of his Gospel, speaking of the Word, says that in him was Life, and the Life was the Light of Men. † And so also in this Epistle the Son is called the Word of Life, and it follows that the Life was manifested, and that they, the Apostles, had seen, and bare Witness, and shewed unto them that eternal Life which was with the Father, and was manifested unto them. ‡ And in this very Chapter he tells them that God hath given to us eternal Life, and this Life is in his Son, and that he that hath the Son hath Life. These Texts from St. John's Gospel, and his Epistle, both separately, and still more in Conjunction, explaining, and supporting each other, yield a full Proof of the Son's Eternity, and Divinity. But if you should still insist that the Text is ambiguous, and may possibly bear your Sense, I must desire you, as I have often had occasion to do before, to consider what an Injury it is to the sacred Writers, to charge them with such a loose, and ambiguous way of writing. If Christ is not the true

* Joh. 1. 4.

† Ch. 1. 1, 2.

‡ V. 11, 12.

God, to what purpose was this latter part of the Verse added at all, which in the most obvious, and natural Construction, seems to call him so, and which, if not referred to him, would be quite needless and superfluous? And how came this great Apostle to begin his Gospel, and both begin, and close, his Epistle in such ambiguous Terms (I speak according to your Hypothesis) as should seem calculated to puzzle, and mislead Mankind, and has actually deceived both *Christians*, and *Heathens*, and even the *Arians* themselves?

For as this Beginning of St. *John's Gospel* has been quoted, and urged in Proof of our *Lord's Divinity*, by the first *Christian Writers*, so was it understood in the same Sense by the *Heathens*. 'The Emperor *Julian* severely censures St. *John*, as being the first, who ventured to call our *Saviour God*: and then refers us to the Beginning of his *Gospel*. 'In another Place he quotes this first Verse, and pretends that it contradicts those Passages of the *Old Testament*, which assert the *Unity of the Godhead*. He is well answered by *Cyrril*, where you will find an Answer to yourself, who now

* *Julian* Ap. *Cyrril*, Lib. x. sub init.
P. 262.

* 1b. L. viii.

revive the same Objection, *Amelius* also, who was co-temporary with *Origen*, quotes this Text, as expressive of the Son's Divinity.— *This is the Word* (says he) *by whom being eternal were made the things that were made, as is Heraclitus's Opinion, and whom verily the Barbarian* (i. e. *St. John*) *says was with God, placed in Order and Dignity of a Principle, and was God, by whom all things absolutely were made.*

If therefore we will be concluded by the Force of plain Words, the Manner of Expression, the Context, the Occasion of writing, the Agreement of the Gospel with the Epistle, the concurrent Testimony of *Christians*, and *Heathens*, or the Distress, which all those have been driven to, who have laboured to force these Words to any other Sense, we must acknowledge that *St. John* designed here to teach us that the *Son* is truly and properly *God*, co-eternal with the *Father*.

The same Doctrine is also taught by *St. Paul*. As *St. John* in his Gospel teaches us that *the Word was God*, and that the same *Word was made Flesh*, * so *St. Paul* tells us that *God was made Flesh*. † But here too you make the

* Apud Euseb. Præp. Evangel. L. xi. C. 19. See the Original quoted in my Vindic. Pt. 1. P. 24. See also *Grotius* Whitty Annot. † 1 Tim. iii. 16. † P. 56.

same weak Exceptions as before, about the Supreme, and the *invisibile* God: and tell us again that the Word God is often taken in an inferior Sense. But not relying on this, you have another Evasion. You say that it is far enough from being certain that—*et*—God, is the true Reading—and that Sir Isaac Newton has come little short of a Demonstration that this Word is a shameful Forgery. And you fall very severely upon Mr. B. for considering a disputed Text as authentick. But Mr. B. might very justly return your Compliments, and desire you not to set up for an Expounder of Scripture, nor treat the genuine Words of holy Writ as shameful Forgeries, without first considering what has been said in Vindication of them. This Point has been fully considered by the learned Mr. John Berriman in his critical Dissertation upon this Text; where he has with great Judgment, and Candour, examined every thing that has been advanced for, and against, the present Reading: and has fully vindicated the Reading—*et*—from all reasonable Suspicion of Forgery. This Book may not be in every one's Hands. * But this Point is also fully discussed by Dr. Mills in his *New Testament*. There you will find

* See also *Whitby* Annot.—*Pearson* on the Creed, P. 128.

that

that the Word—*Θεός*—is extant in all the *Greek MSS.* excepting one or two: and above ninety have been collated. In the *Alexandrian MS.* which is now in the *British Museum*, the original Reading seems at first sight to be—*ος*—and some officious Hand has in other Ink added the transverse Line. But on closer Inspection you may see an old transverse Line in old Ink, almost worn out: so that the true original Reading was plainly—*Θεός*—This Dr. Mill has observed: I have myself seen it, and so may any one else, who will take the Pains to consult it. This Word is also in the ancient *Greek Citations*, though indeed of these we have not many. But Objections have been made against this Reading by *Dr. Clarke*, and others. First, it is said, that *all the old Versions have it—qui, or quod.* But this is not true. We have the Word—*God*—in the *Arabick Version*. The *Vulgate Version* indeed renders it—*quod manifestatum est.* The *Syriac*, as translated in *Bp. Walton's Polyglott*, has it—*quod manifestatus sit in carne, &c.*—the *Ethiopic* in like manner—*quod apparuit in carne, et justificatus fuit in Spiritu.*—So that these Translators, though they seem to have read the Word—*ος*—in the

* Script. Doctr. N°. 540.

Original, yet understood the whole of *Christ* and if so—*ἰσχυρῶς ἐν παντί*—must refer to---*Σὺ ζῶντες*---in the precedent Verse, and *Christ* must be here called *the living God*. The Truth I take to be this. As they generally wrote the Word in short---ΘΣ---these Translators might make use of some Copies, where the tranverse Line was not easily visible, as we see the Case is at present with the *Alexandrine* Copy, and might read it---Ος---And then the *Latin* Translators thinking it to refer to—*mysterium*—might translate it—*quod*—But surely the Authority of these Versions, not agreeing one with another, can be but of little Weight against the united Testimony of in a manner all the *Greek* MSS. As to the *Latin* Fathers, the common Reading among them is---*quod*: But the Text is not cited, as I know of, by any *Latin* Writer before the 4th Century: and they, I suppose, took their Citation from the *Latin* Version then in Use.

As to the Charge of *Forgery* brought in the Letter to *Le Clerc*, it has been fully examined by Mr. *Berriman*, and shewn to be an idle and inconsistent Story, supported by no sufficient Proof, and highly improbable in every Circumstance. * This Story is also sufficiently exposed

* See also *Mill*. Nov. Test.

by Bp. Pearson. But what fully confutes this little less than *Demonstration* is that the Text is cited with the Word---ὁὖς---as it stands now in the *Greek*, by several Writers, who lived before the Times of *Macedonius*, who is accused of corrupting it, particularly by *Gregory of Nysa*, *Chrysostom*, *Cyril of Alexandria*, *Theodoret*, &c. I do not mention *Dionysius of Alexandria*, nor *Athanasius*, because the Genuineness of those Pieces, in which it is found, has been doubted. But I cannot omit the Testimony of *Ignatius*, and *Hippolytus*, who, though they do not expressly cite this Text, yet plainly allude to it. * *Ignatius* speaking of *Christ* says---οὕτως ἀνθρώπινως φανερούμενος.---
 † *Hippolytus* speaks still more plainly---Οὗτος προσελθὼν εἰς κόσμον οὕτως ἐν σώματι ἠφανερώθη.

Farther, the present Reading---ὁὖς---agrees best with the Context, and other Passages of *Scripture*. It agrees, as I observed before with *St. John's Gospel*, where we read that *the Word was God*, and that *the Word was made Flesh*. And this Expression---ἠφανερώθη---is in other Parts of *Scripture* applied to *Christ's coming in the Flesh*. * *St. Peter* speaks of *Christ*, as being

* Epist. ad Ephes. S. 19.

† Contra Nest. S. 17.

* 1 Pet. i. 20.

manifest

manifest---*φανωσθης*---in these last Times for us. * And St. John teaches us that the *Life*, that is, the *Word of Life*, which was with the Father, was manifested---*φανωσθης*---unto us.---
 * And again---For this Purpose the Son of God was manifested---*φανωσθης*---that he might destroy the Works of the Devil---And this Reading agrees with the Context, and makes the Sense natural, easy, and consistent. The Appearance of Christ in the Flesh, was certainly, and without Controversy, a great Mystery of Godliness. And this God manifest in the Flesh was justified in the Spirit. * It was the Spirit who bare Witness to him both at his Baptism, * and by the many Signs and Wonders wrought by him, and his Apostles. He may also very properly be said to have been seen of Angels. * Angels desired, and stooped down, to look into the Wonders of his Incarnation, and Death. * They proclaimed his Birth; * they ministered unto him in his State of Humiliation; and * they assisted at, and declared his Resurrection. He was also preached unto the Gentiles, and be-

1 Job. i. 2. *2* Job. v. 6. *3* Matt. iii. 16. See Hammond Whitby Annot. *4* John. xv. 26.
5 Heb. ii. 4. *6* 1 Pet. i. 12. *7* Luk. ii. 9. &c.
8 Matt. iv. 11. *9* Luk. xxii. 43. *10* Matt. xxviii. 2. &c.

lived on in the World. And he was received up into Glory, when he ascended into Heaven.
 "The Word—*ἀνελήφθαι*—is, the Word commonly used in *Scripture* to express our Lord's *Ascension*, and properly signifies taking him up where he was before. We see here the Language is proper, and the Sense easy, and consistent. This cannot be said of either of the other Readings. If you read—*οἱ*—unless you refer it to the Words—*οἱ δὲ ἄγγελοι*—it is not easy to make either Grammar, or Sense, of it. If you read—*ο*—the Construction is very forced and unnatural. Besides that it reduces the three last Articles into one, the *Gospel* cannot be said to have been *received up into*, or *in Glory*, but by a very strange and unusual Figure.

But however, Sir, you may be pleased to read the Text, I beseech you not to be so lavish of your Censures on you know not who of *Forgeries*, *foisting in Texts*, &c. We might, at least with equal Justice, charge the *Arians* with altering, and corrupting *Scripture*. But Variations, and Errors, will often occur in ancient Writings without any Fraud, or Design, by the Carelessness, or Ignorance, of Transcrib-

" *Mar.* xvi. 19.—*Act.* i. 2, 11, 22.—*Luk.* ix. 51.

ars. * Mr. *Fisher* has given you a very probable Account of the Text you triumph so much in, 1 *Job*. v. 7. to which you have not been pleased to make any Reply. * The Genuineness of this Text has been also well vindicated by the learned Dr. *Twells*. I shall content myself with referring you to him and Mr. *F*, for an Answer to your *demonstrative Evidence*. I shall only add that, if this Text is spurious, it might at first be added as a Comment: and another Transcriber might insert it as a part of the Text. This is a Case, which has often happened. On the other hand, if it is genuine, as the same Words occur in the Beginning of the 7th and 8th Verse, a Scribe might omit what came between; and, if this happened early, the Error might be propagated through many subsequent Copies. And this too is no uncommon Case. As to the Text before us, I see no Reason to suspect any Forgery, or fraudulent Design, on either Side. The Word—*οζ*—(as I observed before) might be easily mistaken for—*οΣ*. But we have here the Reverse of what you brag of, with regard to the other Text. The present Reading is confirmed by

* P. 36, &c. * Critical Examin. of the new Text and Vers. of N. T. P. ii. Chap. 3. See also *Mill*, Nov. Test.

almost all the *Greek* MSS. extant: nor have we the least Reason to doubt of its *Genuineness*.

As to the Proof of our *Lord's Divinity* drawn from the *Form of Baptism*, * which you pass over so cavalierly, and treat with such Indecency, I have treated of it fully in my * *Answer to Mr. Lindsey*, * and in my *Vindication* before: I think I need add no more to what I have there said. Nor is there any of your Arguments from *Scripture*, but what has either there, or in these Papers, been either fully answered, or sufficiently obviated.

I come now to your Pleas from *Antiquity*: and here too I might justly refer you to what I have already said. I have also all along confirmed my Explications of *Scripture* by Quotations from the ancient Fathers, from whence it will fully appear what were their Sentiments with regard to our *Saviour's Divinity*. * But you still maintain Mr. S's Assertion, that all *Christian People* for upwards of three hundred Years after *Christ*, till the Council of *Nice*, were generally *Unitarians*, that is, in your Sense of the Word, *Arians*. And you censure Mr. B. very severely for calling this a bold, and unsup-

* P. 73.

* P. 115.

* P. 48. &c.

* P. H. P. 54. &c.

ported Assertion, without first confuting it. It had been effectually *confuted* by several learned Writers before: and has, I humbly apprehend, been since sufficiently disproved, both by Mr. *Bingham*, and myself. But I shall not be unwilling to consider what you have farther to offer on this Subject. And here, First, the good Father, whom you and Mr. *L.* principally boast of, is *Clemens* Bishop of *Rome*. But you give us only two or three Words from his Epistle to the *Corinthians*, without any Reference to what Part of the Epistle it is to be found in, or to the Context. I find it in Sect. 46. It is an Exhortation to Unity, and Concord, and plainly refers to *Eph. iv. 4.* though it is somewhat differently worded—*Have we not* (says he) *one God, and one Christ, and one Spirit of Grace poured forth upon us, and one Calling in Christ*—St. Paul adds—*One God, and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all.*—This very Text has been alledged by some of the Ancients, and particularly by *Irenæus*, who lived not long after *Clemens*; in Proof of the Doctrine of the *Trinity*. However that be, it is plain, and has

¹ P. 84.

² L. v. C. 18:

³ See above, P. 18. 19. See also *Whitby* Annot.—*Waterland's* 1st. Def. P. 10.—2d. Def. P. 59, &c,

already been shewn that St. Paul did not hereby intend to exclude *our Lord* from being Partaker of the Godhead. No more, I presume, did his *Fellow Labourer* St. Clement. As to the *Doxologies* quoted by you and Mr. L. they are no other than what we find in many Parts of our own Liturgy. * But there is another *Doxology* in the same *Epistle*, which Mr. Fisher quotes, as addressed to *Jesus Christ*. † And you chastise him very severely for citing it unfairly, and leaving out what goes before. ‡ I am censured too for *not exhibiting it fairly*, though it seems I am *the least blameable of the two*. But why do you, who complain so grievously of Omissions, take no Notice of what I said before and after? § I produced *Doxologies* from Writers very nearly as ancient as St. Clement, addressed personally to *Christ*, and which could not possibly admit of any other Construction. And I alledged also several Texts of *Scripture*, where *Glory* is given immediately to *our Lord*, such as *Rev.* i. 5, 6.—v. 13.—vii. 9. 10.—*Heb.* xiii. 20. 21.—2 *Pet.* iii. 18. With regard indeed to this latter Text, I acknowledged in a Note, that some MSS. read differently.

* Sect. 20.

† P. 172.

‡ P. 177.

§ P. 93. &c.

But

But I acknowledged too much. - These MSS. I find by Dr. Mill, are only two, and the Syriac Version. And therefore both I, and Mr. Fisher, might reasonably suppose that this *Doxology* of St. Clement—to whom be Glory and Majesty throughout all Ages—was addressed to our Lord, the Word—*ἀντὶ*—to whom—in the natural Construction of the Words relating to the immediate Antecedent—*Jesus Christ*—There is another *Doxology* also in the same Epistle, Sect. 50. where, though God the Father is indeed mentioned in the former part of the Sentence, yet there seems to be less Pretence for referring the *Doxology* to him. The Words are—*This Blessedness cometh upon those who are chosen by God, through Jesus Christ our Lord, to whom be Glory for ever and ever, Amen.* Let any common Reader judge whether this *Doxology* is not addressed to our Lord *Jesus Christ*. And why should you, Sir, * who think it lawful to pay such Worship to the Son, as to his high Office may seem suitable, be so angry with those, who ascribe such Glory to him, as you yourself seem to think his Due? Why should you put a forced Construction upon all such *Doxologies*, as seem addressed to him: and make an addition

to St. Peter's Text, against the Faith of all the MSS. excepting only two, and one Syriac Version? But *Clemens* (you tell us) in the Words proceeding calls *the Father the great Creator, and Sovereign, of the Universe*, and represents *our Lord as his Instrument and Minister*. From whence you would argue that *Glory and Majesty is to be ascribed, not to the Minister, but to the Sovereign*. But why not to both? *Athanasius* himself speaks in as high Terms of the *Sovereignty of the Father*, as *Clemens* does. And we hold with both a Distinction of Persons between the *Father*, and the *Son*. And we acknowledge the *Son*, with regard to the Oeconomy of Man's Redemption, to be inferior to the *Father*, and to act, as his *Minister and Delegate*. And we pay *Worship*, and *Glory*, to him, both as *God in the Beginning*, and as *Mediator between God and Man*. And this we may do without overlooking, or diminishing, the *Glory* due to *God the Father*.

And, as *Clemens* speaks in high Terms of the *Sovereignty of the Father*, so he speaks also in very magnificent Terms of the *Son*. 'He calls him *the Scepter of the Majesty of God*: and in St. Paul's Language *the Brightness of his*

♦ Sect. 16. See *Bull*, Def. Fid. Nic. Sect. II. Cap. iii.

Glory, * and so much greater than the Angels, as he hath obtained a more excellent Name than they. They are only Messengers and Ministers, but of the Son he said---Thou art my Son : this Day have I begotten thee.---Again † in another Place he tells us that our Lord Jesus came of Israel---נִנְּאָרָא עֲרֵאנָא---as concerning the Flesh : which Words are borrowed from St. Paul, and plainly imply that he had another Nature besides his human. What that was St. Paul will tell you---He was God over all, blessed for ever. Nay Clemens himself in one Place expressly calls him---God---* You were content (says he) with the Portion given you by God, and gave heed diligently to his Words---and his Sufferings were before your Eyes.---The Word---αἰὼς---his---plainly refers to the Antecedent---τῷ Θεῷ---God---Christ therefore, who suffered for us, is here called God, and that with the Article---τὸν Θεόν.

The same Doctrine is still more fully delivered in his second Epistle, which begins thus—My Brethren, we ought so to think of Jesus Christ, as of God; as of the Judge of quick and dead; nor ought we to think meanly of our Salvation.—† But we are told that, before we quote

* Sect. 36.

† Sect. 32.

* Sect. 2.

† P. 174.

this Epistle, we ought to prove its Authenticity, which is greatly disputed. But, if we must give up every thing that has been disputed, we must give up some part of our *Canonical Scripture* too, for the *Authenticity* of some Books of this *has been greatly disputed.* And the Authority of *Clement's* first Epistle has been questioned. As to this second Epistle I shall freely acknowledge that its *Genuineness* has been called in Question by some considerable Writers, whose Learning, and Judgment, I have the greatest Regard for, and particularly A. Bp. *Usher.* But on the other Hand, it is placed amongst *St. Clement's* Writings by *Du Pin, Dr. Cave,* and A. Bp. *Wake:* and its *Authenticity* has been supported by ^a *Cotelerius,* ¹ Bp. *Bull,* ^a and Bp. *Beveridge,* ¹ *Eusebius* mentions both Epistles. The *First* he says was generally received. The *Second,* he says, *was ascribed to him: but was not so well known as the First, for he does not find it quoted by any of the Ancients.* It is plain therefore that this Epistle was extant before *Eusebius's* Time, and was by some ascribed to *St. Clement.* Nor does *Eusebius* pronounce it *spurious;* but only says it was not so well

^a Patres. Apost. ¹ Def. Fid. Nic. Sect. II, Cap. iii.

^a Cod. Can. Eccl. Prim. illustrat. Lib. ii. Cap. ix. S. 10.

¹ Eccles. Histor. Lib. iii. C. 10.

known, and attested as the First Epistle. Now it is very possible, in those Days, when the Use of Printing was not known, and Copies of Books were not easily multiplied; and spread abroad, that genuine Pieces of eminent Men might be, some lost, and others little known in the World. It has been the Case of some of the sacred Writings themselves. And *Eusebius* speaks more doubtfully of some Books of *Scripture*, than he does of this Second Epistle of *St. Clement*. In the following Ages * *Jerom* tells us that *this Epistle was rejected by the Ancients*. * And after him *Photius* calls it *spurious*. And yet both * *Jerom*, and * *Photius*, in other Parts of their Works ascribe two Epistles to *St. Clement*. In the *Apostolical Canons*, * which are generally allowed to be of great Antiquity, * both Epistles are reckoned among the sacred Writings, and ascribed to *St. Clement*. * And in the most ancient MS of *St. Thecla* the two Epistles of *St. Clement* are also added to the sacred Writings, from whence we may conclude they were both read in the Churches. And

* *Cant. Script. Eccles.*

* *Biblioth. Cod. cxii.*

* *Adv. Jovin. Lib. i. C. 7.*

* *Cod. cxvi.*

* *See Beza's Vindict.*

* *Can. 76.*

* *Beza's ut supra.*

* *Epiphanius* also reckons two Epistles of *St. Clement*, and tells us that they were both read in the Churches in his Time, in the fourth Century. Nor is there any thing in the Style, or Matter, of this Epistle, which can give us Reason to suspect it of a later Date. It is a serious Exhortation to a good Life: and a Spirit of Piety breathes through the whole. It is most certainly of great Antiquity, and wrote long before the Council of *Nice*, and most probably is the Work of *St. Clement* himself. As to this full Testimony of our *Saviour's* Divinity, *Ignatius*, who was his Co-temporary, speaks in full as high Terms, "as may be seen in the Passages before cited from him:

You produce no other Proof from Antiquity, but only second-hand Quotations. " The first you give us is from a Letter of *Mr. Chillingworth* published in his Life by *Des-Maizeaux*. This very Letter was quoted for the same Purpose not many Years ago by *Bp. Clayton*. In my Answer to him I thought I had fully disproved the Contents of it, and did not expect to hear of it so soon again. My Performance may perhaps have never come to your Know-

* *Hæres xxx. No. 15.*

" See above, P. 94.

^ P. 118, &c.

ledge, or you may have thought it beneath your Notice. But surely a Regard to your own Credit might have taught you not to produce second-hand Quotations, without ever consulting the Originals, and expose yourself by referring to Testimonies, which every one prove directly against you. It is indeed an *hard Task* to answer the same Objections over and over again. But as you introduce this Quotation with such an Air of Triumph, be pleased to take the same Answer. First then this Letter is not to be found in any of Mr. *Chillingworth's* Works, which he himself published, but in his Life wrote many Years after his Death by *Des Maizeaux*: it came accidentally into his Hands; nor does any one know when it was wrote, or to whom. It is well known that Mr. *Chillingworth* had some Scruples about Subscription to our Articles, which he afterwards happily got over. This Letter, if at all wrote by him, might be wrote during this Interval, And I cannot but think it very hard upon learned Men, if they are to answer for every thing which may at any time have dropped from them in their private Correspondence. And very ill do you use both this excellent Person, and your Reader, to palm such an Extract upon him, as the Sentiments of Mr.

Chillingworth,

Chillingworth, who knew what he said as well as any Man.

But, as these References come recommended to us under so great a Name, it may be proper to consider them particularly. In the first Place then we have here a very wrong Representation of the Proceedings of the Fathers at *Antioch*, who condemned *Paul of Samosate*. *Athanasius* nowhere says that they affirmed expressly that the Son is not of the same Essence with the Father. * On the contrary, in the very Place here referred to he sets himself to prove that they did not contradict the Council of *Nice*. He mentions it as an Objection, † that some affirmed that the Bishops, who condemned *Paul*, had said, that the Son was not consubstantial with the Father. * He answers this Objection at large. He says he has not the Epistle of the Synod by him: but that, if this were true, yet both the Councils of *Antioch* and of *Nice*, might be free from Blame; that, if they differed in their manner of Expression, we ought to consider their Design

* De Synod Arim et Seleuc. Tom. i. P. 917.

† Ως αὐτοὶ φασί.

* Εἰ ἀμφοτέρων ἡ Συνόδος ἀφ' ὧν ἐμνημόνευσαν ἐπὶ τῷ Οὐνοῦ οἱ ἅγιοι καὶ ἡμεῖς διαφερόμενοι αὐτοῦ, ἀλλὰ τὴν διανοίαν αὐτῶν ἐκινῶν, ἡ πᾶσις ἐκκλησία ἀμφοτέρων ἡ Συνόδων τιμωμένηται. lb. P. 919.

and

and Meaning, and then we should find they were perfectly agreed. He proceeds to shew in what Sense the Council of *Antioch* might reject the Word—*consubstantial*, he produces several Instances of Phrases, and Expressions, which might be, and had been, in a different Sense, affirmed, and denied, of the same thing, both in *Scripture*, and other Writers; he says that the Council of *Antioch* might with good Reason reject the Word—*consubstantial*—though it had been used by former Writers, because it had been perverted to a bad Sense by *Paul of Samosata*, and the Council of *Nice* with as good Reason re-assume it, as the strongest Bulwark against the Errors of *Arius*. * To the like Purpose speaks *Hilary*. It is the Word—*consubstantial*—and not the Doctrine, which he tells us the eighty Fathers rejected. In the Doctrine both the Councils were agreed. But we have better Authority than either *Athanasius*, or *Hilary*. We may appeal to an Evidence, which *Athanasius* had not. We have extant the Epistles of this Council of *Antioch*, in

* Male intelligitur *Homoousion*, quod ad me bene intelligentem? Male *Homoousion Samosanetus* confessus est: sed nunquid melius *Ariani* negaverunt—Si vero & probando, & improbando unum utrique statuerunt, quid bene constituta convellimus.—
De Synodis, P. 320.

which

which^b they affirm expressly that *the Son was before all Ages essentially God*. They bring also several Texts to prove his Divinity: and amongst the rest, *Rom. ix. 5.* which they apply to him to prove that *he is over all God blessed for ever*. It appears also from this Epistle as well as from other Testimonies that the Error, for which this *Paul* was condemned, was the Denial of our *Lord's* Divinity. *Eusebius* tells us that the Bishops assembled together against this Man, *as against a wild Beast that worried Christs Flock*. And the Fathers themselves in their circular Epistles preserved by *Eusebius*, censure this Heretick, *as denying his Lord and God*,^c and fighting against God; and call his Tenets *the wicked Heresy of Artemas*—*a deadly Doctrine*—*a God-denying Wickedness*.—It appears therefore that these Fathers were so far from contradicting formally the Council of Nice, that they not only held the

^b Παρ' αὐτοὺς ὡς ἐκ ἀποφάντος, ἀλλὰ ὡς ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ
 γὰρ. Labbe Conc. Vol. I. P. 845.

^c Euseb. Eccl. Hist. Lib. vii. C. 27.—Athanas. de salut. adv. Jes. Christ. P. 635.—Augustin. de Hæres. Cap. 44. Epiphani. Hæc. 65.

^d Ὁ ἐν τῇ λαομασίᾳ τῇ Χριστῷ ποιεῖται.
 Euseb. ib.

^e Τὸ Θεὸν τὸ ἰσχυρὸν καὶ Κύριον λαομασίᾳ.

^f Ἀποστασίᾳ ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ.
 Ὁ τῇ μακρῇ αἰσίου τοῦ

ἀρχαίου.
 Θεομασίᾳ διδασκαλίας.

^g Ἀρσενίου ἡγουμένου. Ib. C. 30.

same

same Doctrine, but judged it to be of the utmost Importance.

As to *Justin Martyr*, *Tertullian*, and *Novatian*, since we have here no Quotations, nor any particular Expressions alledged from them, it might be sufficient to refer to Bp. *Bull*, who, in his *Defence of the Nicene Faith*, has fully explained, and vindicated, all such Expressions, as either here, or elsewhere have been thought liable to Exception. As to *Justin* * I have in my Vindication shewn at large what were his Sentiments with regard to the *Eternity*, and *Divinity* of the *Son of God*. But I can farther add that we have no where in all Antiquity stronger Proofs of his *Eternity*, and *Divinity* than in the Treatises here referred to: nay we have very strong ones in the very Pages we are here directed to, ^m Some of which I shall give in the Margin.

The

* See *Bull* Def. Fid. Nic. Sect. ii. C. i. No. 9, &c.—*Jud. Eccl. Cathol.* C. iii. No. 5, &c. *Waterland* Import. Dbst. Trin. P. 327.—*Thirlby* Answer to *Whiston's* Suspicions, P. 162, &c.—*Berriman's* Histor. Acc. P. 144. P. 111. P. 28, &c.

^m "Ἀγγελος καὶ υἱος, ὁ Θεὸς ὑπαρχων, ἀφ' οὗ καὶ πνευματικὴ τῆς Μαρτί. *Just. Mart. Dial. cum Tryph.* P. 283.—Ὁς ὁ καὶ ἐστίν, καὶ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ ἄγγελος, P. 356.—Κύριος καὶ Χριστός, ὁ Θεός, ὁ καὶ υἱὸς ὑπαρχων, P. 357.—Hanc me regulam professum quā inseparatos ab alterutro *Patrem & Filium & Spiritum* testor tene ubique, & ita quid quomodo dicatur, agnoscen-

The two next Quotations relate only to the Opinion of *Dionysius* Bp. of *Alexandria*, and amount to no more than that *Basil* tells us that *Dionysius*, in his Writings against *Sabellius*, had bent the Stick too much the other Way, and by his improper, and incautious Expressions, sown the first Seeds of the *Arian* Heresy.

* But he does him the Justice to own, that it was not any ill Meaning, but only a great Zeal against *Sabellius*, which had betrayed him into these unwary Assertions. On the other Hand *Athanasius* not only vindicates *Dionysius*, but gives Extracts out of his Writings, in which he apologized for himself, and declared his Abhorrence of the Doctrines charged upon him. * The whole Affair is well worthy our

tes. Ecce enim dico alium esse *Patrem* & alium *Filium*, & alium *Spiritum*. Male accepit idiotæ quisque aut perversus hoc dictum, quasi diversitatem sonet—non tamen diversitate alium *Filium* a *Patre*, sed distributione, divisione alium, sed distinctione. *Tertull.* adv. *Prax.* C. 9.—Hic ergo, cum sit genitus a *Patre*, semper est in *Patre*—semper enim in *Patre*, ne *Pater* non semper sit *Pater*. *Novat.* de *Trin.* C. 31. See *Waterland's* 1st. Def. P. 137.

* *Αἰτίαι δὲ οἷμαι ἑ ποικίλαι γινώμεναι, ἀλλὰ τῇ ἐφεδρᾷ βέλτερά ἀντι-
τίθειν τῇ Σωτηρίᾳ.* Epist. xli. ad *Max.* Philos.

* *Athanas.* de Sent. *Dionys.* Tom. I. P. 548. — De Synod. *Arimin.* & *Selenc.* P. 918. — *Bull* Def. Fid. Nic. Sect. 11. C. xi. No. 2. &c.—Sect. 111. C. 1v. No. 3.—*Cave's* Life of *Dionys.* S. 14. — *Waterland's* Import. P. 350.—*Thiribby's* Ans. to *Whiston's* Suspicion.—*Le Moynes*, Not. ad Var. Sacr. P. 235.

Q

Attention.

Attention. *Dionysius*, in his Writings against *Sabellius*, had in the Heat of Controversy dropt some Expressions concerning the *Son of God*, which had given some Offence to some good *Christians*. A Jealousy being rais'd, the Matter was thought considerable enough to be brought before the other *Dionysius* Bp. of *Rome*. He convened a Synod of Bishops at *Rome*, who considered the Matter, and called upon the Bishop of *Alexandria* to give an account of his Faith. The Charge against him ran high. He was accused of denying the *Eternity* of the *Son*, and affirming that *he was one of the things that were made, and not consubstantial with the Father*. In Answer to this Accusation *Dionysius* wrote an Apology for himself, in which he explained, and vindicated, such Passages in his former Writings, as had given Offence, and in a most ample manner declared his Faith, in a *co-eternal*, and *consubstantial Trinity*. Amongst many others are these remarkable Expressions—*Christ was always the Word, and Wisdom, and Power, of God: for it cannot be said that God, being without these childless, afterwards begat a Son.*—Again

Ἡ ἀνὰ τὴν Χριστὸν Λόγος ὤντων ὁ πατὴρ, καὶ δύναμις ἡ ᾧ δι' αὐτοῦ ἔγενετο ὅτι ὁ Θεὸς ἦν ἐκαστοῦ καὶ πάντων. *Athanas.* P. 559.

—Being

—¹ Being the Brightness or Shining forth of the eternal Light he must also himself necessarily be eternal, for if the Light exists always, it is plain that the Shining forth of it must always exist: for Light is known to be such by its shining forth: nor can there be Light, which does not give Light. —Again.—² The Son only always co-existing with the Father, and full of Existence. As to his denying the Son to be consubstantial with the Father, he answers that the Charge is false. ³ For though he said that he had not found, nor read, this Word any where in the Holy Scriptures, yet his Arguments which followed, and which his Adversaries suppressed, differed not from that Sense. ⁴ Lastly, he thus expresses himself,— Thus we extend the undivided Unity into a Trinity, and again sum up the undiminished Trinity in an Unity. The Expressions are strong, and full,

¹ Απαύρασμα δὲ οὐ φῶς ἀλλὰ πάντως καὶ αὐτὸς ἀίδειος ἐστὶν ὅτις γὰρ αἱ τρεῖς φῶς, δὴλον ὡς ἐστὶν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀπαύρασμα, τὸ γὰρ ὅτι φῶς ἐστὶν τὸ κρταυγάζειν νοεῖται· καὶ φῶς ὁ δυνάται μὴ φωτίζει εἰς αὐτόν. 1b.

² Μόνος δὲ ὁ Υἱὸς σὺν τῷ Πατρὶ, καὶ ὅσοις πληρωμένος P. 560.

³ Εἰ γὰρ καὶ τὸ ὄνομα τῆς φωνῆς μὴ εὐρηκίται μὲν ἀνθρώπων καὶ τῶν ἁγίων γενομένων, ἀλλὰ γὰρ τὸ ἐπιχειρήματα μὴ τὸ ἐξ ἑστῆς ὁρῆς ἀποπληκται, τὸ δυνάται τῆς αὐτῆς οὐκ ἀπὸ τοῦ, P. 561.

⁴ Οὕτω γὰρ ἡμῖς αἱ τὴν Τριάδα τῶν Μονάδων πλατύνονται ἀδελφίται, ὅτι τῶν Τριάδων πάλιν ἀμείνεται εἰς τῶν Μονάδων συνηθλασμένη. See Not. on Athanas. Ed. Bened. Tom. I. P. 255.— Grabe Annot. in Bull. Def. Fid. Nic. Sect. 11. C. xi.

but cannot easily be translated: I have given the Original in the Margin. This Apology of *Dionysius* satisfied the Council: "and afterwards, when the Bishops met at *Antioch* to censure *Paul of Samosata*, who denied our Lord's Divinity, he was invited to the Council, but sent an Epistle, excusing himself on account of his Age, and Infirmities, and expressing his Sentiments on the Points in Debate, and his Detestation of the false Doctrines of that Heretick. The whole Process of this affair is a most undeniable Proof of the Opinion of the Church of that Age, sixty years before the Council of *Nice*, concerning the Divinity, and Eternity, of the Son of God, the high Regard they paid to this Doctrine, and the great Importance they judged it to be of.

And now, Sir, you stand convicted by your own Evidence. You have produced them without Examination: and they all bear Testimony directly against you, and depose that the Eternity, and Divinity, of the Son of God was the general Doctrine of the Christian Church before the Council of *Nice*.

To go on with your accumulated Evidence, the Quotation from *Jerom* concerns only the

* *Engl. Hist. Eccles. Lib. vii. C. 27. 30.*

Opinion of *Origen*. * I have shewn in my Answer to Mr. *Lindsey* what was *Origen's* Opinion concerning the *Divinity* of our *Blessed Saviour*. He had been before indeed vindicated by abler Hands, both ancient, and modern, to which I there referred you. I know that he has been severely censured by St. *Jerome*, and several others, for Errors with regard to other Points, as well as that of the *Trinity*. But does St. *Jerome* say that these Opinions of *Origen* were the Doctrine of the Church in his Days? No: just the contrary. * He apologises for him as having wrote in too great Haste. He tells us that he was censured for these Errors in his Life-time, and wrote an Epistle to *Fabian* Bishop of *Rome*, in which he retracted, and begged Pardon for, these offensive Passages. One Excuse he made was, the same which is here to be made for Mr. *Chillingworth*, that what he had wrote hastily, in his private Correspondence, others through an injudicious Zeal had published. You see then, Sir, that St. *Jerome* too bears Testimony against you.

* As to the Quotations here from *Petavius*,
Perron,

* P. 118, &c.

* Epist. lxxv. P. 11. P. 193.

* *Bellarmino* is wrongfully joined with these. He has a whole Chapter. L. i. C. 16. to prove the *Divinity* of *Christ* from

Perron, &c. we know that the Romanists of those Times affected to charge the Primitive Fathers with *Arianism*, hoping thereby to serve the Interests of the Church of Rome, though such a Charge was really inconsistent with their own Principles. I cannot express this better than in the Words of Bp. Bull.—*Quod si subdolo aliquo consilio, non ex solita tantum sibi audacia, ac temeritate in sanctis Patribus censendis et notandis ista scripssisse censendus sit Petavius, putarim hominem, Jesuitam scilicet, Pontificiae potius quam Arianæ causæ consultum voluisse. Ex eo enim quod Catholici Doctores trium priorum sæculorum plerique omnes eundem planè errorum errarunt, quem postea in Ario ut Hæresim damnavit Synodus Nicæna (quod contendit Petavius) hæc duo facile consequentur, 1^{mo}. Patribus trium primorum sæculorum, quos imprimis appellare solent Catholici Reformatores, parum tribuendum esse, utpote quibus nondum satis perspecta & patefacta fuerunt præcipua Christianæ Fidei capita, 2^{do}. Concilia Occumenica potestatem ha-*

the Testimony of the Fathers. And though he has quoted some spurious Treatises, he has brought sufficient Proof from their genuine Writings, and has, I think, well answered the chief Objections.

✓ Def. Fid. Nic. Proem. N. 8. See also *Waterland's* 2d Def. Pref. P. v. &c.—*Nelson's* Life of Bp. Bull, P. 284, &c.

bere

bere novos Fidei Articulos condendi, sive (ut Petavius loquitur) constituendi, & patefaciendi: unde satis prospectum videatur additamenti illis, quæ regulæ Fidei assuerunt, quæque Christiano orbi obtruserunt Patres Tridentini: quanquam ne sic quidem Fides Romana stabit; cum Tridentina conventio quidvis potius quam generale Concilium dicenda sit. Sed ita scilicet istius Scholæ magistris nulla Religio est Pseudo-catholicam suam Fidem super fidei vere Catholicæ ruinas ædificare. Ipsa Oracula divina nimis obscuritatis condemnanda; sanctissimi primævæ Ecclesiæ Doctores, Episcopi, et Martyres, Hæreseos insimulandi sunt, ut quocunque modo degeneris Ecclesiæ Romanæ fides atque auctoritas sarta tecta conservetur.—The same Bp. Bull has not only, as a Defendant, fully answered all the Objections of Petavius, and others, but has brought clear and strong Proof of the Agreement of these ancient Fathers with the Nicene Council. He has ('as Dr. Waterland justly observes) so learnedly, and effectually, defended the Ante-Nicene Faith, that the Arian Cause has been sinking under the Weight of his elaborate Pieces ever since. *He received the public Thanks of the Clergy in France for them. They met with the general Esteem of the

* 2d Defence, P. 19.

* Nelson's Life of Bp. Bull, P. 383, &c.

Learned in *Europe*, as well *Papists* as *Protestants*, who from that Time have appeared generally well satisfied in the Faith of the *Ante-nicene* Writers, and many of them have stood up in Defence of it. But as *Petavius*, and others, had taken no small Pains to misrepresent these Fathers, and their Pretences had not at that Time been sufficiently examined, we may the more easily excuse Mr. *Chillingworth*, if in his younger Years he was misled by them: they are most to blame, who publish these his Crudities, after every Tittle here advanced has been so fully, and solidly, confuted. I may add too, that all this is retracted by Mr. *Chillingworth* himself. * For in his excellent Treatise of *The Religion of Protestants*, &c. he censures & condemns these very *Popish* Writers for this Charge of *Arianism* on the Primitive Fathers.

* After this curious Quotation you go on to inform us farther, that as *the Christians of the three first Centuries* were generally Unitarians, so perhaps too *the Nice Fathers themselves* were Unitarians, equally at least with some, who are now upbraided with the Name. Pray, Sir, who upbraids you with the Name? No, you most

* Pref. S. 18.

* P. 120.

confidently appropriate the Name to yourselves, in Exclusion of all others. The *Nicene Fathers*, and *Alexander*, who began the Contest with *Arius*, were *Unitarians*, and so too was *Albanasius*, and so I hope we all are. But, if those only are *Unitarians*, who deny our Lord's Divinity, and if the *Nicene Fathers* were *Unitarians* in that Sense of the Word, I desire you would inform us what it was they condemned *Arius* for, and how *Alexander* came to have any Contest with him.

Your Jargon about numerical and generical Substance I understand not. What the *Nicene Fathers* understood by the Word—*ὁμοούσιος*—*consubstantial*—they themselves will tell you; that he was *God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten, not made.* And they reject, and anathematize all those, who say, that there was a Time when the Son was not, and that he was not before he was begotten—or that he was created, or obnoxious to Change. It is very plain that by this Term they meant to assert *Christ's true Divinity, and Eternity.* And the Occasion of this Council was the

R Contest

* *Socrat. Hist. Eccl. L. i. C. 8. 9.*—*Sozom. Hist. L. i. C. 21.*—*Theod. Hist. Eccl. L. i. C. 6. 12.*

* *Socrat. L. i. C. 5, 6.*—*Sozom. L. i. C. 15.*—*Theod. L. i. C.*

Contest between *Alexander* Bp. of *Alexandria*, and *Arius*. Your Unitarian *Alexander* had in his Discourses asserted the Doctrine of a *Trinity in Unity*. But *Arius* preached against him, and taught that *the Son was a Creature, that he had a Beginning, and that there was a Time when he was not*. As to the Word—*ὁμοούσιος*—or—*ejusdem substantiæ*—it was in Use in the Christian Church before the Council of *Antioch*, as appears by *Dionysius's* Epistle above-cited, 'and by *Eusebius's* Epistle in *Theodoret*, * and other Testimonies. But *Paul* of *Samosata*, who seems to have been nearly of Mr. *Lindsey's* Opinion, held *Jesus* to be a mere Man, but actuated by the *Logos*, which he esteemed to be a Part, or Attribute, of *God*. And he pretended that this Word—*ὁμοούσιος*—favoured his Opinion. For this Reason the *Antiochene* Fathers thought proper to forbear the Use of this Word, but they expressed the same Doctrine of *Christ's* Divinity in Terms full as strong and expressive. But on the contrary *Arius*, whose Opinion you seem to have embraced, ascribed

C. 2.—*Arii* Epist. Ap. *Theod.* C. 5. Excerpt. ex *Arii Thalia* Ap. *Athanas.* de Synond *Arimin.* & *Seleuc.* P. 883. Ap. eund: Orat. ii. contr. *Arian.*

* L. i. C. 12. P. 39. * See *Bull* Def. Fid. Nic. Sect. i. C. 1. No. 8, &c.

nity.

to *Christ Pre-existence*, and some Kind of *Divinity*. But then he held him to be an inferior Kind of *God*, neither *co-equal*, nor *co-eternal* with the *Father*.^a And in the *Nicene Council* the *Arians* greatly prevaricated. When they were asked whether they held *Christ* to be *God*, they allowed it, but only in an inferior Sense, in such a Sense, as *Angels* and *Men* are styled *Gods*. If they were asked whether he was *true God*, they answered that he was *truly made* so by *God*. But the Word—*Consubstantial*—they could not so easily evade: though at last they all signed the *Creed*, excepting only two. And this was the Word, which they afterwards objected to, and would fain have expunged out of the *Creed*. Great Pity is it that there was not so wise a Man amongst them as yourself to explain the Meaning of it to them. You say they granted *Supremacy, and Priority, to the Father*. They might do so, but such only as is consistent with a perfect Equality of *Nature, and Substance*. Those Fathers held the *Son* to be *God of God, very God of very God*. As to the Word—*μονοθεῖος*—and—*ταυτοούσιος*—whence you took them, you tell us not:

^a *Theod. L. i. C. 8.*—*Athanas. de Synod. Nicen. P. 267.*—*De Synod. Arimin & Seleuc. P. 920, 921.*

They are, I think, Terms invented by the *Sabellians*, who denied a Distinction of *Persons* in the *Godhead*. The *Nicene Fathers*, in Opposition to both them, and the *Arians*, held that they were *three Persons, but one God*. They neither confounded the *Persons*, nor divided the *Substance*.

¹ But you tell us that *this Contest occasioned the most horrid Butcheries, and Massacres*. Pray, Sir, when, and by whom? by the *Arians* under the Emperors *Constantius* and *Valens*, who persecuted the *Homoousians* even to *Death*; and by your *Unitarians*, the *Goths*, *Vandals*, and *Hunns*. ² But I have fully considered this Charge in my Answer to Mr. L. I refer you to what I there said, and to the Authorities there cited.

³ But you are pleased to say that *Alexander of Alexandria was indisputably Unitarian*: that is, if you mean any thing, an *Antitrinitarian*. What he, who began the Contest with *Arius*, himself an *Arian*? Pray, Sir, did you ever read the Epistle here referred to? No; you give it us at second Hand from Dr. *Jortin*. You have really very bad Luck at these second-hand Quotations. This *Alexander* was the

¹ P. 121.

² P. 139, &c.

Person who first called to Account, and censured *Arius*, and his Adherents, for denying the *Divinity* of our *Saviour*.¹ And we have an Epistle of his still extant, wherein he asserts the *Eternity*, and *true Divinity*, of our *Blessed Saviour* in the strongest and fullest Terms, And yet from this very Epistle you bring Quotations, which you borrowed from Dr. *Jortin*, to prove that this *Alexander* was an *Unitarian*. But you go much farther than your Principal, "All that Dr. *Jortin* concludes from his Quotations is that *the Difference between Alexander, and the Semi-Arians, seems not to have been great*. You more boldly pronounce that he was *indisputably Unitarian*. We have indeed the greatest Reason to complain of Dr. *Jortin* for his shameful Partiality. There cannot be a stronger Instance than in the Passage before us. He has given us here an incoherent Medley of every thing he could pick up to the Discredit of the *Nicene Council*, concealing and suppressing every thing on the other Side. In the Epistle referred to *Alexander* has given several strong Proofs of our *Lord's Divinity* from *Scripture* from *Joh. i.* — *Heb. i.* — *Col. i.* &c: These

¹ Ap. *Theod. Eccl. Hist.* L. i. C. 4.

² Remarks on *Eccles. Hist.* Vol. iii. P. 47, &c.

the Dr. passes very slightly over: " but ridicules him for urging a weak Argument, or two. But surely this is not dealing fairly, either by the Author he quotes, or by his own Readers. There follow in Dr. Fortin's Remarks the two Quotations, which you give us. I cannot tell to what Purpose the first is quoted. It directly contradicts the Inference, which you, and the Dr. would draw from it.—*The Son (says Alexander) is inferior to the Father only in that he is not Unbegotten—as the Lord himself hath taught us, saying—the Father is greater than I.*—And what can we desire more Orthodox? especially, as *Alexander*, in the foregoing Words, and those immediately following, asserts the Son to be *immutable as the Father, a perfect Son exactly like the Father, his perfect Image, in nothing differing from him; that he existed from all Eternity; that we are to give due Honour to the Son, declaring his Generation from the Father without any Beginning, acknowledging his necessary Being before all Ages; not denying his Divinity, but ascribing to him an exact Likeness in all things to the Father.*—This surely is neither *Arianism*, nor *Semiarianism*, but the direct

^a I can find but one of these Texts in our Epistle, nor is that urged by way of Argument.

Reverse. Dr. Fortin indeed takes some Notice of this Context, though in plain Contradiction to himself. You more wisely, and consistently, though not quite so honestly, have left this quite out, and taken only such Part from the Drs. Remarks, as you thought might suit your Purpose. As to the Text quoted here from St. John's Gospel, I should rather think it relates only to *Christ's mediatorial Office*. Alexander interprets it of his *Divine Nature*, according to which he acknowledges the Son to be inferior to the *Father*, as being the *Second Person*, and receiving his Essence from the *First*: but then he holds him to have existed with the *Father* from all Eternity, and to have received from him the same unchangeable Essence. * And many orthodox Writers both before, and since, interpret this Text in like manner: * amongst the rest *Athanasius* himself, in his second Oration against the *Arians*—*He said the Father is greater than I, not with regard to any Excellency, or Priority of Time, but because of his Generation from the Father.*

In the other Passage quoted I can see only one Word liable to Exception—*Φύσις*—This

* See Bull Def. Fid. Nic. Sect. iv. C. ii.—*Pearson* on the Creed, P. 34.

† P. 365.

Dr. *Jortin* has taken care to give us in great Letters: and he treats *Valesius* with no small Contempt for giving us a favourable Interpretation of this Passage, and quotes him very unfairly. He charges him with saying what he does not say, and leaves out the principal thing he does say. So far indeed *Valesius* says, that this Expression ought to be favourably interpreted: and that by—*ὅους*—he means *Person*. And methinks, Sir, the Dr. and you, who understand *Greek* so well, should have known that the Word—*ὅους*—is of various Significations. Not only *Valesius*, but the Lexicographers, *Stevens* and *Suicer*, tell us that it sometimes signifies the same as *Person*. But *Valesius* says more, that *Alexander* uses the same Word in the same Sense in the very Page before, where we are told that when our Lord said, *I and my Father are One*, he did not say he was the Father, —*ὅς τις τῆς ὑποστάσεως δύο ὅους μίαν εἶναι*—nor that two Persons were one—This the Dr. takes no Notice of. But supposing that *Alexander* were guilty here of an Impropriety of Expression, his Meaning is very plain. He had said before that the *Arians* objected that those who would not allow that the Son had a Beginning, and was made out of nothing, must allow that there were two—*ἀγνῆτα*—unbegotten, or self-existent

existent Beings. He answers that, *there was a wide Difference between the Unbegotten Father and the things created by him out of nothing: but that there was a Medium between these, the Only-begotten, by whom the Father of God the Word made all things out of nothing, who was begotten of the Self-existent Father.*—His Doctrine is plainly this, that the Son was not *unbegotten* like the Father, nor *created*, as all other Beings are. And not long after follows your other Quotation, where he says, that *the Son is in no other Respect inferior to the Father, only in that he is not Unbegotten.* This is so far from favouring of *Arianism*, that it is an Answer to an Objection of the *Arians*, the self same Objection, which you are perpetually repeating, as if it never had been answered, that *there cannot be two Self-existent Beings.* Alexander here in express Terms declares that *the Son is no Creature*, but that *by him all things were made.* And in what follows he expresses (as we have already seen) his Belief of our Lord's Divinity, and Eternity, in the most full and explicit manner. After all the Word is not—*μὴν Φύσις*—*Middle Nature*—but *μεταμετα Φύσις*—*the Person, or Being, who meditated between God the Father, and the World*—by whose Ministry he first created all things,

S

and

and afterwards redeemed Mankind. And why might not this *Middle Nature*, as you call him, be equal to the *Unbegotten Father*? When the *Houfholder* sent his one Son, his well-beloved, to his *Husbandmen*, this Son, though far superior to the *Husbandmen*, might be equal to his *Father*. If a King should take his Son to be Partner with him in the Throne, and should transact all Matters with his Subjects by his Intervention, this Son, though far above the Rank of a Subject, would be equal in Rank to his Father. But, supposing these Passages to be really exceptionable, which neither of them are, what can be more unfair, or disingenuous, than to pick out an incautious Expression, or two, from an Author, and from thence take Occasion to charge him, contrary to the Faith of all History, and contrary to his own express Words, with holding Opinions, which he is well known to have strenuously opposed, and which the very Work quoted was written purposely to confute? However I shall allow that *the Difference between the Doctrine of Alexander, and that of the Semi-Arians was not great.* * For these *Semi-Arians* pretended that they

* See *Epiphanius. Hæres.* 73. — *Socrat. Hist. Eccles. Lib. 2.* C. 37, 39. *Theod. Lib. ii.* C. 17.

were falsely accused of denying the *Divinity* of *Christ*, as others have done since: and they dressed up their Doctrines in such ambiguous, and plausible Terms, as deceived many orthodox, and well-meaning Persons. But *Alexander*, and *Athanasius*, saw through their Artifices.

We have next a Story of *Pachomius the Monk*, taken from *Tillemont's H. E.* I have not the Book, and where *Tillemont* picked up this idle Story I cannot tell. ^b *Sozomen* mentions it as a Report, that an Angel appeared to this *Pachomius*, and exhorted him to gather a Society of Monks. But I cannot find in any approved Historian any Account of this Voice from Heaven directing him to follow the Doctrine of *Alexander*. And the Inference drawn from hence is most extraordinary.—If this be true (which certainly it is not) a Man may be orthodox, without coming fully up to that Standard of Orthodoxy, which was fixed in later Ages.—What can one say to a Man, who can trifle in this manner? Truly, Sir, I profess the same Faith, which *Alexander* does in his two Epistles now extant, taught, not by an immediate Voice from Heaven, but by St. *John*, and St.

^b Lib. iii. C. 14.

Paul, the Authors he quotes : and I am able to prove that *the Standard of Orthodoxy*, with respect to the Doctrine of the *Trinity*, was the same in those Days, as it is now among us. I am also very sure that neither the *Semi-Arians*, nor the *Arians*, of those Days came up to the Standard of modern *Heterodoxy*. It is with great Unwillingness that I pass so severe a Censure on Dr. *Fortin*. But you have compelled me. Such Quotations, supported by such Authority, required some Animadversion. Dr. *Fortin* was undoubtedly a Man of great Learning, and, I believe, a Man of an unblemished moral Character. And he has wrote some valuable things in Defence of our most holy Religion: I am sorry that he should disgrace his Character by these hasty Remarks. May his good Deeds meet with Acceptance at *the Throne of Grace* : and may God in his Mercy overlook his Errors, Failings, and Prejudices.

I come now, Sir, to your *Appendix*, which, it seems was occasioned by my *Vindication*, which did not come to your Hands, till your Letter was nearly printed off. And I ought to esteem myself happy that it did not reach you sooner. My Book, it seems, affords much matter for Reprehension : if you had had it sooner I should, I suppose, been rewarded according to my Deserts

Deserts. Still more happy are Dr. *Horne*, and Mr. *Bingham*, what they have wrote, I presume, has not come to your Notice: so they have wholly escaped the Lash of your Pen.

After Thanks to you for your kindly *excusing my Prejudices*, I come to consider the little you take Notice of. As to the *Doxology of Clemens*, I have already given you, I think, a sufficient Answer. Your next Charge may concern me more. *I have not been nicely scrupulous*, you tell me, *with regard to my Authorities*, I quote an *Epistle of the Church of Smyrna*: but I ought first to have *vindicated its Authenticity*. Vindicated, Sir, against whom? I never knew before that its *Authenticity* was questioned. It has been received as genuine in all Ages; it was read publicly in the Churches: and its *Authenticity* is allowed by all the learned Moderns. Dr. *Middleton*, who questions the Truth of some Particulars in it, allows it to be *one of the most authentick, and celebrated Pieces, in all primitive Antiquity*. The learned A. B. *Wake*, who published an *English Translation* of it, tells us, that it is a *Piece of the most unquestionable Credit, and Antiquity*.

* See above, P. 108, &c.

* Free Inquiry, P. 124.

* Prelim. Disc. Ch. vi. P. 60.—See also *Tortin's Remarks*, Vol. II. P. 101, &c.

As for the main Body of it, he adds, we find it preserved in 'the Ecclesiastical History' of Eusebius, who lived not above an Age and a half after the writing of it. And even the Manuscript itself, made Use of by A. Bp. Usber, is so well attested, that we need not any farther Assurance of the Truth of it. It has indeed an Attestation, which scarce any other ancient Writing has. At the End of it we have this Testimony.—These things Caius transcribed from the Copy in the Hands of Irenæus the Disciple of Polycarp, who was himself co-temporary with Irenæus. And I Socrates of Corinth transcribed it from Caius's Copy. And from this Transcript Pionius tells us he copied his. But you tell us that you find by consulting the Annotations on Eusebius, that there is a Writing under the Name of the Epistle of the Church of Smyrna; but some suspicious Circumstances attended its Introduction into the World in its present Form.—What Annotations you consulted you tell us not: I have looked into Valesius' Annotations, who tells us the direct contrary. Eusebius, as he himself tells us, has not given us the whole of this Epistle: but has omitted the Beginning, and the Conclusion. What he has given us

¹ Eccles. Hist. Lib. iv. C. 15.

agrees exactly with the *Manuscript* made use of by A. Bp. *Usher*, only with such Variations, as are common in different MSS. of the same Book. And *Valesius*, instead of questioning the Authenticity of this Copy of *Pionius*, seems to lament that *Eusebius* has not given us the whole Epistle: and supplies the Omission by inserting in his Note what was wanting, from A. Bp. *Usher's* Edition. The only Objection you have against this Copy of the Epistle, is from a very false Account you give us of *Pionius's* Testimony to it, which you had not from *Valesius*: it is I suppose your own—I shall therefore give it in the Original — Εγὼ δὲ πάλιν Πιόνιος ἐκ τοῦ προσηγεαμμένου ἔγραψα, ἀναζητήσας αὐτὰ κατὰ δότικάλυψιν φανερώσαντός μοι Πολυκαρπῆ, καθὼς δηλώσω ἐν τῷ καθέξῃ, συναραγνὼν αὐτὰ ἤδη χεδὸν ἐκ ἑξήκοντος κεκμηκότα—κ. τ. λ.—Now I think the Word—αὐτὰ—in the Plural Number, cannot relate to this particular MS. but to the Acts of *Polycarp* in general. And so again—αὐτὰ ἤδη χεδὸν ἐκ τοῦ ἑξήκοντος κεκμηκότα—does not, I apprehend, signify that the MS. had been *long lost*, as you tell us, or that it was *in a ruined Condition*. The meaning I take to be, is, that the Memory of the Particulars relating to *Polycarp's* Death had been almost lost through length of Time: but he, finding this MS. had recovered a full

a full Account of them, and has given it an entire. Who this *Pionius* was, does not appear: some think that he was a *Christian*, who suffered Martyrdom in the Persecution under *Decius*. Nor am I concerned to account for, or vindicate what he says about *the Revelation made to him by Polycarp*. You may call him a *Visionary* if you please. If he dreamt, or fancied, that he had such a *Revelation*, this will not hurt the Credit of the Manuscript, which he found. The Agreement of *Eusebius's* Copy of it, and the Coherence of those Parts, which he has omitted, with what he has inserted, sufficiently authenticate the whole, some few Variations only excepted. But you tell us that *Eusebius* gives us this Prayer in Words totally different from my Translation. I had *Cotelerius's* Edition before me, and took my Quotation from thence. I find on Comparison but little Difference between this and the Copy in *Eusebius*. There is a small Variation in the Particles, which I suppose you would lay great Stress on. In the *Usserian* Copy it runs—*δοξαζετε ουν τω αιωνιω & επανω ιησϋ χριστω μετ' εσϋν & Πνευματι αγιω η δοξα*—In *Eusebius* we read—*δοξαι τω αιωνις απχεριως ιησϋ χριστω—δ' ε σϋ ουν αιρω εν Πνευματι αγιω δοξα*—I took my Quotation, as I said, from the former: And so has the

the learned Mr. Bingham done before me, and has brought the same *Doxology*, together with others, in Proof of the Worship of *Christ* in the second Century. But then he subjoins a Note, in which he takes Notice of the various Reading in *Eusebius*, and very rightly observes that *this makes no Alteration in the Sense, for still it concludes with a Doxology to the three Divine Persons—By whom, and with whom, unto thee, in the Holy Spirit, be Glory for ever and ever. Amen.*—All I can blame myself for is that I did not add some such Note, which would have precluded even this little Cavil of yours. Nay, A. Bp. *Usher* suggests a Suspicion that the Copy in *Eusebius* might be corrupted in Favour of the *Arians*; but then he adds that the *Latin Translation*, which he found with the *Greek MS.* has it—*per æternum Pontificem omnipotentem Jesum Christum, per quem tibi, et cum ipso, & cum Spiritu sancto, gloria, &c.*—I shall farther add, that this Attestation of *Plinius* ends with this *Doxology*—*Jesus Christ, to whom be Glory with the Father, and the Holy Ghost, for ever and ever, Amen.*—And not only this, but the *Church of Smyrna* conclude their *Epistle* with *Doxologies* addressed to *Jesus Christ*, as

* *Antiq. B. xiii. Ch. ii. S. 2.*—See also *Berriman* on *Plim. Dox. P. 26, &c.*

T

thus

thus—^a *Jesus Christ reigning for ever, to whom be Glory, Honour, and Majesty, and an everlasting Throne, from Generation to Generation.* And again—^b *Jesus Christ—μὲν δὲ ἵ—*with whom be Glory to God and the Father, and the Holy Ghost—This I produced in my Answer to Mr. *Lindsey* immediately before the other Quotation: but this you make no *Scruple* of passing by. You will tell me, perhaps, that these are wanting in *Eusebius's* Copy. Very true: and so are the four last Sections of the *Epistle*. But in whatever *ruined Condition* you may suppose *Pionius's* Copy to have been, you will not, I hope, think to persuade us that he added all this to the *Epistle*. And what will you say to another Passage in this same *Epistle*, ^c which I alledged too in Proof of *the Worship of Jesus Christ* in those early Ages? This is extant in *Eusebius's* Copy, not many Lines after your Quotation: and must have stared you in the Face, when you were transcribing it. They tell us that *Polycarp's* Persecutors applied to the Governor, that his Body should not be given to the Christians to be buried, lest (said they) they forsaking him that was crucified should begin to worship this *Polycarp*—not knowing that we never

^a Sect. 21.^b S. 22.^c P. 104.

can forsake Christ—nor worship any other. For (add they) we worship him indeed, as being the Son of God: but the Martyrs we worthily love, as the Disciples, and Imitators of the Lord.—Had you, who question the Faithfulness of others, attended to this plain Proof of the Worship of Christ by the Primitive Christians, you might have spared your Criticisms on the Difference of the two Copies. We may learn from either of them to praise, bless, and glorify, the Father, and with him also his beloved Son.

There is only one thing more in my Work, which you have thought proper to offer your Remarks on, and that is, my Interpretation of our Saviour's Expression:—Job. xvi. 23. But it is surely very strange that in a Book, which afforded you so much matter for Reprehension, you should choose to pick out this, wherein you cannot contradict me, without contradicting yourself. Mr. Lindsey had alledged that in this Text Christ seemed in Words, as express as can be used, to forbid Men's offering up Prayers to himself. * You declare your Dissent from Mr. L. in this Particular. You acknowledge some Worship to be due to the Son; at least think it not sinful to pay such Worship: though you do

* P. 75. 76.

indeed seem to be wavering in this Point. And yet here you defend Mr. L's Interpretation of this Text, which, if allowed, proves against yourself, that Christ has forbid any *Worship* to be paid to himself, and therefore it must be *sinful*.—I think I need add but little to what I said before. The Words of the Text are—*In that Day ye shall ask me nothing.*—I observed that the Word in the Original is—*ἰσχυρήσθε*—that this Word, though sometimes it may signify *to petition*, yet in its common Acceptation signified *to interrogate*, or ask a Question. And that it signified so here, I proved from what went before, v. 19. &c. and from the Disciples Answer, v. 30.—*Now we are sure that thou knowest all things, and needest not that any Man should ask thee*—*ὅτι τίς σε ἰσχυρήσεται*—And that the Words which follow begin a new Sentence, I shewed from the solemn Introduction, and from the Change of the Word from—*ἰσχυρήσθε*—to—*αἰτήσθε*—And in this Sense are the Words understood by almost all the Commentators. And the Reasons which I gave for so interpreting them are no other than what had been given before by Dr. Hammond, and Dr. Whitby, to whom I referred you. But what have you to say to this? *You will not deny*

that in this Verse the Verb signifies to interrogate or ask a Question: but you do insist that this is not its whole Signification here. So that, this same Verb in the same Proposition has two different Senses, and we are to take it in both. And so, if I understand you right, we are here forbid either to *interrogate*, or to *petition*, or to make any Application at all to *Christ*. And here again I must ask you how you will reconcile this to what you seemed to allow before, "that the *Apostles*, after our Lord's *Ascension*, might pray to him, as commissioned to hear, and grant their *Petitions*. And the only Reason you give for this extraordinary Interpretation, is, that in the Words following our Lord encourages them to *ask the Father in his Name*, without any Mention of himself as the Object of Prayer. Curious Logick indeed is this! Our Lord encourages his Disciples to *ask any thing of the Father in his Name*: therefore he forbids them to ask any thing of himself. Such Reasoning as this must drive all Opponents to their last shifts: for where there is no Argument there can be no Answer, and where there is no Difficulty, there can be no Solution. But let me desire you, Sir, to turn to the parallel Pas-

sage, *Job. xiv. 13.* where our Saviour says to his Disciples—*Whatsoever ye shall ask in my Name, that will I do.*---But how can he do it, if he is not omniscient? if he cannot know our Wants, and we cannot, and must not, make any Application to him. I thought I had given you a clear Explication of this Passage before. The Sense runs easy. Our Saviour's Design was to comfort his Disciples grieved at the News of his Departure. He tells them that, though they could not then apply to him personally for Information, yet they would not be left without Resource. They would have free Access to the Father through his Intercession; and *whatsoever they should ask the Father, in his Name, he would give it them.* What our Saviour here orders is, that all Prayer to the Father should be offered in his Name: but he does not here forbid us to address any Prayer, or Worship, to himself. That he is the Object of Worship I have shewn at full, both from Scripture, and Antiquity; and have as yet received no Answer, either from you, or Mr. Lindsey, or any one else. The same has been since proved very satisfactorily by my learned Friend the President of Magdalen College.

And yet you, who are consistent neither with Mr. Lindsey, nor with yourself, are pleased to

to charge the *Albanasians*, as you call them, with *Disagreement* among themselves. 'The *Souths*, (you say) the *Bennets*, the *Waterlands*, &c. undertook to explain this inexplicable *Doctrin*e, and the *Consequence* was, that they disagreed utterly in their *Explications*. But before you threw out this contemptuous Language, you should have considered how easily the Charge might be retorted. We acknowledge that the *Doctrin*e of the *Trinity*, and our *Lord's Incarnation*, are *Mysteries* above our *Comprehension*, and that it is difficult, in treating of them, to express ourselves with *Precision*, or *Propriety*. And therefore it is not to be wondered at, if Persons agreeing in the main Point have differed in their manner of expressing themselves. And it has so happened that some have engaged with too much Warmth, and Acrimony, in Defence of their particular *Explications*. Nay sometimes, perhaps, there have been Faults on both Sides.

But pray are you *Unitarians* at all better agreed? Be pleased to look into Antiquity. You may see how little Agreement there was among your *Unitarians* from the Beginning: *Ebion* held our *Lord* to be a mere Man the Son

of *Joseph* and *Mary*. *Cerinthus* held two Persons in our *Lord*; *Jesus* a Man conceived in the natural Way, and *Christ* a celestial Spirit, inferior to *God*, which descended from above, and resided in the Man *Jesus* from his Baptism to his Crucifixion, and then returned where he was before. * In the following ages arose *Theodotus*, *Artemon*, *Beryllus*, *Paul of Samosata*, and others, who all of them agreed in denying our *Lord's* Divinity, but had each of them new and singular Opinions of their own. Were the *Arians* in *Atanasius's* Time better agreed? No. † The Members of this *Sect* (says *Mosheim*) were divided among themselves, and torn into Factions, which regarded each other with the bitterest Aversion. Are our modern *Anti-Trinitarians* all united in their Sentiments? No. You all agree in denying the eternal Generation of the Son. But when he was begotten you cannot agree. ‡ Dr. *Clarke* says, he was begotten by an Act of the Father's Will, but as the Attributes and Power of *God*, are as eternal as his Being, this Generation cannot be limited to any definite Time. Others held that he was begotten before

* See *Waterland's* Import. Doct. Trin. P. 246, &c.

† *Mosheim* Eccl. Hist. Cent. i. C. ii. C. 5. and Authors quoted by him.

‡ Script. Doct. Trin. P. 247.

the Worlds, but not from all Eternity. Socinus, and Mr. Lindsey, maintain that he never existed till he was born into the World. Nor can you agree what Divinity to ascribe to him, or whether any. * Some tell us that the Word God is only a relative Term, and signifies Dominion, * Others say that the Title of God is given to him only as expressive of some Godlike Power given to him by God the Father. * You tell us that he is styled God, because he is transcendently the greatest of God's Ministers, and because he was God's Vice-Gerent in the Work of Creation, and Redemption. Mr. Lindsey holds him to be a mere Man, and will not allow him to be ever called God in Scripture. * Some of you allow that he created the World, but only by a delegated Power: Socinus and * Mr. Lindsey contend that the Creation attributed to him is only a moral Creation, a Regulation, and Reformation of Mankind. * Some of you hold that he appeared to Moses, and the Patriarchs of old, others say that it was only a created Angel, who so appeared, * Mr. Lindsey maintains that it was Jehovah the one Supreme God,

* Ib. P. 163.

* Bp. Clayton Essay on Spirit, P. 89.

* P. 48, 70.

* Dr. Clarke, Ib. P. 181, &c.

* Bequel, P. 480. [let him show, readeth understand, if he can.]

* Remarks, P. 69.

* Bequel, Ch. vi.

and that there never existed any visible Representative of the invisible God. Nor can you agree what *Worship*, or whether any, is to be paid to *Christ*. * *Dr. Clarke* allows the *Son* to be invested with distinct *Worship* in his own Person. *Socinus*, though he denies the *Divinity* of the *Son*, yet allows *Worship* to be due to him; * You seem to be wavering in this Point, you make a Doubt whether any, or what *Worship* is due to the *Son*, but at last you do not think it sinful to pay such *Worship* as to his high Office of *God's Vice-gerent* may seem suitable: *Mr. Lindsey* absolutely denies any *Worship* to be due to the *Son*. We have already seen what various Interpretations you give us of the Beginning of *St. John's Gospel*, and how inconsistent you are with one another, and with yourselves, in explaining what is meant by the *Word*, or *Logos*. I may add, that you, and *Mr. Lindsey*, differ widely in your Explication of almost every Text urged in Proof of our *Lord's Divinity*. So that I may justly say with *Dr. Waterland* that the various *Hereses*, which have affected this *Scripture Truth*, are but the various *Wanderings* of human *Imagination*. *Truth* is simple and uniform, while *Error* is almost infinite.

* P. 338. * P. 75, 76. * See above, P. 86.
 c Import. Doct. Trin. P. 328.

A P P E N D I X.

I HAD nearly finished this Letter, when Mr. *Lindsey's* Sequel to his *Apology* was brought to me, I therefore thought fit to delay the Publication, till I had read over this long laboured Performance. But, on the Perusal of it, I found Reason to make but little Alteration of what I had written. Mr. *Lindsey* writes indeed with more Temper, and Modesty, than the *Remarker*: but there is too much Reason to complain of great Unfairness and Disingenuity. He is pleased to advance the same Assertions as before with equal Confidence, without taking scarce any Notice of what had been said in Answer to him. I humbly think that both Mr. *Bingham*, and myself, had brought full Proof, that religious Worship was addressed to the *Son* in all Ages from the Apostles Days, down to the Council of *Nice*. Mr. *Lindsey* in his *Apology* had brought no Proof of his confident Assertion, but only a Reference to Dr. *Whitby*. But what does Dr. *Whitby* say? nothing to his main Point. He attempted to prove that the *Ante-nicene* Fathers did not profess the same Doctrine which we now ascribe to the Council of *Nice*. But he thought Worship due to *Christ*: and he knew, and acknowledged, that the ancient Fathers believed the Pre-existence of *Christ*,

and paid Worship to him. I told Mr. L. that every thing that Dr. *Whitby* had said had been fully answered by Dr. *Waterland*. And he is pleased to tell me that *it does not become me thus blindfold to resign up my Faith to Dr. Waterland.* A gross and wilful Misrepresentation this. I had told him expressly in the next Page that *we need not rely on the Authority of Dr. Whitby, Dr. Waterland, or Bp. Bull.:* and I brought Proof of the *Worship of Christ* from most of the best Writers of the three first Centuries. To all this he says nothing, only that *let them speak of Christ in ever so high Terms, or call him God, or occasionally offer up Prayers to him,* he is still Proof against Conviction. For he says, *they take Care always to let us know that they meant by it no more than a created, inferior, dependent God:* but of this he neither does, nor can, bring any Proof. But, passing by all that we had alledged from the most early Fathers, he again calls in the Aid of *Origen*, and *Lactantius*: to both which I had objected as incompetent Witnesses, both because they lived not before the third Century; and because they were both generally allowed to be hasty, and inaccurate, Writers. But he urges again the same Passage from *Origen de Oratione*, without

* Pref. P. xvi.

* P. 14.

looking

looking back to what he says in the Words immediately preceding (though I had pointed it out to him) where he teaches us to address ourselves to *Christ*, after the Example of *St. Stephen*. I farther brought several Passages from his Book against *Celsus*, the most valuable Part of his Works, which shew not only that he thought Worship due to the *Son*, but that it was the general Practice of the *Christians* in his Time. These too are passed over without any Notice: and yet he has the Assurance to face us out that the Practice was condemned by the more judicious *Christians* at that Time. Nor does *Origen* in the Passage cited, say that *Christ* was a Creature of God, one of our Brethren: on the contrary he seems to distinguish him from all Creatures. ^c

^c I find the like Answer given by Dr. *Waterland*, 2d Def. P. 402. What you farther cite from the Piece—*and* *origen*, whether *Origen*'s own, or solsted in by some other Hand, is of no Moment in the Case, being clearly contradicted in his Treatise against *Celsus*, which is certainly genuine, and contains *Origen*'s last and maturest Thoughts upon the Subject. Do you ever find *Origen* placing the *Son* among the—*παῖδες*—in his Book against *Celsus*? Doth he not constantly distinguish him from them, and set him above them, making him—*ἀπαρτὸς*. To which we may add this—*Sed & in principio Epist. ad Corinth. Scribit—Cum omnibus qui invocant nomen Domini nostri Jesu Christi, eum cujus nomen invocatur, Deum Jesum Christum esse pronunciat—invocare Domini nomen, & adorare Deum unum atque idem est.* Lib. viii. in Epist. ad Rom. c. 10.

It

It may perhaps be thought scarce worth while to vindicate *Lactantius*. But, as this is almost the only thing in my Answer, which Mr. *Lindsey* has thought worth his Notice, and as we shall have here a curious Specimen of his Unfairness in Quotation, and his skill in evading the Force of an Argument, I shall consider what he has to say more fully than it deserves. As to the Passage cited, I allowed it to be inaccurately, and improperly, expressed. But I shewed, as Mr. *Bingham* had done before me, from the Context, and the whole Tenor of *Lactantius's* Discourse, that he could mean no more than that our Lord, as *he was sent to take away a Plurality of Gods, and teach that there was only one God*, did not set himself up as another God distinct from that one God—*alium præter unum*. In Proof of this I urged that the Title of the preceding Chapter is—*De Jesu Deo et homine*—and in that, and other Chapters before, *Lactantius* frequently calls him God, which Mr. *Lindsey* himself allows. And not only this, but he applies to him Prophecies, which are plainly descriptive of the true God.—*Is. xlv. 7. 14.*—*Surely God is in thee, and there is none else, there is no God.*—*Psal. xlv. 6.*—*Tby Throne,*

O God, is for ever and ever.—And another, quoted from *Jeremiab*, but to be found in the *Apocryphal Book of Baruch*, iii. 35, 37. This is our God, and there shall no other be accounted of in Comparison of him.—Afterward did he shew himself upon Earth, and conversed with Men.—And he tells us that the Prophet *Isaiab* by the Name *Emanuel* signified that God was to come to Men in the *Flesh*. On Perusal therefore of this Passage, and comparing it with the Context, I cannot but conclude that *Lactantius* looked upon *Christ* as God.

But another Passage is produced to prove that he means only an inferior, created, God: but which proves rather the Reverse. *Lactantius* here tells us that before the Creation of the World God begat his Son, and afterwards by him created innumerable other Spirits, whom he called Angels. Here is asserted in express Terms the Pre-existence of the Son: and he is distinguished from all Creatures. All other Spirits were created: the Son was begotten, not made. In the latter Clause Mr. *Lindsey* is pleased to foist in the Word—*multo*—a little Word, but which quite alters the Sense.—It implies a Comparison, as if in what others also excelled, the Son excelled *multo*. But in the Original it is a positive Assertion, without any Comparison—*hunc tamen solum*

solum primogenitum divini nominis appellatione dignatus est, patriâ scilicet virtute ac majestate pollentem.—This his First-born alone he honoured with the Name of God, as he was mighty in his Fathers Power and Majesty.—Such Expressions as these are surely too high for any Creature. And a little after *Lactantius* applies to *Christ*, a Verse from the *Sibylline Oracles*.—Αὐτὸν σὺν γινώσκει Θεὸν Θεὸν ἡν̄ υἱὸν σου — Acknowledge him as thy God, being the Son of God.

Once more. I had charged Mr. *Lindsey* with quoting from *Lactantius* an Objection made to the *Christians* by the *Heathens*, and leaving out his Answer which followed immediately after, and was pointed full and strong against him, and proved not only that *Lactantius* himself believed that *Christ* was truly God, and that *Worship* was due to him as such, but that this was the Doctrine, and the Practice, of the Church in his Time. • But what says Mr. *L.* to this? Does he deny the Charge of quoting the Objection, and leaving out the Answer?

• In the Edition of *Lactantius*, which I consulted, Lugdun. 1548. it is—*æternum & mortalem Deum*—and so it is in some others. But other Editions read—*alterum & mortalem Deum*. I shall not dispute which is the true Reading: I own that I prefer the latter. But my Argument did not turn on this Point.

No.

No. But after some little Altercation about a various Reading, he stubbers over *Lactantius's* Answer, and endeavours to disguise it by such a Translation, or Paraphrase, as is not easily to be paralleled. *Lactantius* says, that it was objected to the *Christians* that they worshipped two Gods, God the Father, and God the Son. [†] *Lactantius* on the contrary does not deny, but own, that they called the Father God, and the Son God: but (says he) we do not call them different Gods, nor do we separate the one from the other: because the Father could not be without the Son, nor can the Son be separated from the Father.—Since therefore the Father makes the Son, and the Son the Father, there is one Mind, one Spirit, one Substance to both.—And in the following part of the Chapter he sets forth the Divinity of the Son, and the Worship due to him, in very plain Terms, [‡] as I have already shewn. But *Mr. Lindsey* cannot see the Co-eternity, or Consubstantiality, of the Son in this Passage. And he is pleased to translate the

[†] Cum dicimus Deum Patrem & Deum Filium, non diversum dicimus, nec utrumque secernimus: quia nec Pater sine Filio esse potest, nec Filius a Patre secerni.—Cum igitur & Pater Filium facit, & Filius Patrem, una utrique mens, unus Spiritus, una substantia est.

[‡] P. 126,

latter Clause—*una utrique meus; unus Spiritus; una Substantia est*—being of the same Mind and Disposition, and also deriving his Substance, i. e. his Being and Powers from him—and then he adds a farther Explication, not warranted by the Original. A Man who can construe—*una Substantia est*—deriving his Substance from him—is, I am afraid, incapable of Conviction by any thing that I can add. If he cannot see *Consubstantiality* in this Expression, I cannot but think, with Mr. Bingham, that he must wilfully shut his Eyes. ^a Besides he wholly passes over what I laid the principal stress upon. He had asserted, and still continues to maintain, that it was the universal Practice of the Christian Church for the three first Centuries to address religious Worship only to God the Father, and not to Christ, and had brought this very Passage in Proof of it. To this, among many other things, which still continue unanswered, and are, I presume, unanswerable, I urged that the

^a Mr. Lindsey tells us that he borrowed this curious Quotation from one Ben Mordecai. I have been severely censured for speaking contemptuously of this most learned Person. *Remarker*, P. 179. I said that I suspected him to be one of their own Fraternity, who personated a Jew, the better to attack the Doctrine of the Trinity. And now I find my Suspicions verified. Mr. Lindsey owns the Truth,—*Seq.* P. 298. I must desire to be excused if I pay no regard to this Pseudo-Ben Mordecai.

Heathen

Heathen of those Times perpetually charged the *Christians* with worshipping a dead Man, and that the *Christian Apologists*, and particularly *Origen*, and *Lactantius*, instead of denying the Charge, vindicated the Practice by alledging that *Christ* was *God*, one *God with the Father*. What a shuffling Writer then have I to deal with, who, forgetting the main Point in question, still continues to insist on a crude Expression, or two, of these inaccurate Writers, in Opposition not only to their own Doctrine, but to their full Testimony to plain Matter of Fact? But he stands convicted by the Suffrage of all Antiquity, and by the Evidence of the very Witnesses, which he produces.

¹ In another Place he would fain press *Justin Martyr* into his Service. And here again we are referred to Dr. *Whitby*, who has evinced even to a *Demonstration* that *Justin* was an *Arian*. I beg leave in return to refer him to my Vindication of the Doctrine of the *Trinity*, * where, though I pretend not to *Demonstration*, I humbly think, I have brought sufficient Proof that *Justin* held the *Pre-existence*, the *Eternity*, and the *True Divinity* of the *Son of God*. ¹ Nay our Author himself owns that *Justin* believed

¹ P. 400.

* Pt. III. P. 28, &c.

¹ P. 309.

that our *Lord* appeared to *Moses*, and the *Patriarchs*, and charges him with *catching at Straws to support this Point*. What then has he to produce from *Justin* in his Favour? Little, or nothing. A Passage is alledged from his Dialogue with *Trypho the Jew*, which sets forth that our *Lord* took upon him human Nature, and became one of our *Brethren like unto us*: but not one Word can I find that declares, or intimates, that he was *God only in an inferior Sense*. "Not long before *Justin* tells us that he, who was the *Son of God*, and existed before all Creation, was born of a *Virgin*, and became *Man*: and then in the following Pages he sets forth his *human Nature*. The Doctrine taught here throughout is the same with that of the *Nicene Creed*, that he, who was *God of God*, was incarnate by the *Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary*, and was made *Man*. And accordingly in the very Page before the Passage cited, *Justin* says that he, who was the *Only-begotten of the Father of the Universe, the Word and Power—id est—properly and peculiarly begotten of him, afterwards became Man born of a Virgin*.

To the Passage from *Justin*, where he calls the *Father the Lord of all things absolutely, and*

of *Christ himself*, ^a I have already answered, that the Primitive Fathers, constantly held that Christ's mediatorial Office, commenced from the Creation, or at least from the Fall, and that his Appearances to the Patriarchs of old were Preludes to his Manifestation afterwards in the Flesh, and that in all of them he acted, as his *Fathers Minister*, and *Messenger*, who in this Respect was his *Lord*, and Superior. ^o And in the Words almost immediately following, *Justin* tell us that, *he who appeared as a Man, and Angel, was Lord and God, being the Son of God.* ^p And soon after he says that, *this Power was begotten of the Father, by his Power, and Will, but not by Section, as if the Substance of the Father was divided.* And the same Doctrine he delivers in many other Places.

But the most extraordinary Quotation of all is that, where instead of *Justin's* Sentiments, he gives us *Trypho's* Objection. ^v *Trypho* it seems, thought it astonishing, and ridiculous, to suppose *Christ* to be a *God pre-existing before the World, and afterwards to condescend to become a Man.* The very Objection supposes that *Justin* did hold that *Christ pre-existed before the World.*

^a Vindic. Pt. III. P. 43.

^o P. 357. ed. Par.

^p See my Vindic. p. 31. and see also *Bull. Def. Fid. Nic.* Sect. II. c. iv. n. 3, 4.

And

And so he does assert over, and over. 'He calls *Christ the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob*, 'the God and Lord of Hosts, to whom *David ascribes Worship, and Glory*. Psal. xxiv. xcvi. and, 'the God, whose Throne is for ever and ever, 'who existed before the Morning-Star, and the Moon. " And he afterwards resumes the same Subject, and proves that *Christ appeared to the Patriarchs*, and that *he was God before the Creation of the World*. " And he proves, from the *Psalms*, that *Christ existed from all Eternity*, and is *God, and the Object of Worship*. And why did our Author omit *Justin's Answer* to this Objection of *Trypho*? because it is too applicable to himself. 'I know that this seems strange, especially to those of your Nation, who will not understand, nor practise, the things of God. * Mr. Lindsey may esteem *Justin a very indifferent Interpreter of the Jewish Scriptures*: but what becomes of his bold Assertion that *Justin, if ever he called Christ God, did it in an inferior, subordinate Sense*, and that *he had no Idea of his being the Object of Worship*? And what must we think of a Writer who quotes an ancient Author for an Objection, and suppresses the

' P. 253. ' P. 254. * P. 257. † P. 264. " P. 275.

* P. 286, 287. † P. 287. — † P. 267.

* P. 306.

Author's Answer to the Objection? What must we think of one who alledges Proofs, which carry their own Confutation along with them on the very face of them?

But I must not pass by a most curious Chapter, wherein Mr. *Lindsey* displays great Learning in examining *the Testimony of the Apostolical Fathers*: but to what Purpose I cannot tell, unless it be most effectually to confute himself. Not one of them speaks his Sentiments: but the direct contrary.

As to St. *Barnabas**, the first Passage produced runs thus—*For unless Christ had come in the Flesh, how should we Men have been saved beholding him? For those, who look upon the Sun, which is the Work of his Hands, and shall hereafter cease to be, are not able to endure stedfastly to look against the Rays of it.*—The Latin Translation omits *the Work of his Hands*.—The Greek Original ascribes the Work of Creation to *Christ*: both that and the Translation teach the Doctrine of *Christ's Incarnation*, and *Pre-existence* in Glory and Splendor far superior to that of *the Sun*: in direct Contradiction to Mr. *Lindsey*, who holds him to have been only a *Man divinely commission'd*.

* P. 428. *Barnab. Epist. S. v.*

In another Passage, cited by our Author, ^b *Barnabas* quotes *Gen. i. 26.* where we read that *God said, Let us make Man in our Image, after our Likeness:* and says that *the Father spake this to the Son.* And here again the *Latin Translation* omits this Circumstance. But then the same Translation in the 5th Section, which is wanting in the *Greek*, calls *Christ the Lord of the whole Earth*, and says that *the Father spake these Words to him before the Beginning of the World.* What clearer Testimony can we desire to the Eternity and Divinity of the Son of God? This Text, ^c as I observ'd before in my Answer to Mr. *Lindsey*, is brought in Proof of our Lord's Divinity by other ancient Writers, and particularly by *Justin Martyr*, who lived not long after *Barnabas*. ^d He observes that the Plural Number—*Let us make*—plainly denotes a Plurality of intelligent Agents. Nor can it be said (adds he) that *God spake this to the Angels*, or that *Man was created by the Angels.* But the true Offspring of God the Father co-existed with the Father before all Creatures, and with him the Father here holds Discourse. ^e And in another Place he says that such Words will not admit of a figurative Interpretation, as some Sophisters have

^b Sect. vi. p. 19. ^c P. 6. ^d Dial. cum Tryph. p. 285.

^e P. 359.

attempted to expound them, who are not able either to speak, or understand the Truth. One of these *Sophisters* Mr. *Lindsey* seems to be, who tells us that *Barnabas* is here speaking of a *moral*, or *Spiritual Creation*. He does indeed speak of a *new Creation*: but he quotes these Words, as spoken by God the Father at the Creation of Mankind, and says *they were address'd to the Son*. And if so, he must believe the Son to be God also, existing before all Creation. But it was his Custom to force a mystick allegorical Sense upon the Scriptures of the Old Testament. Why then is he cited? Not a single Sentence can be produced from this whole Epistle any way favouring our *Apologist's* Sentiments. If his Testimony is of any Value, it is point blank against him. As to the Epilogue at the End of the *Latin Translation*, it asserts of *Christ*, that *all things were made by him, and for him*, and ascribes all Honour, and Glory, to him. But this I lay no Stress on, not being satisfied of the Antiquity of this Translation. The *Greek Original* is certainly of great Antiquity. * It is quoted by *Clemens of Alexandria*, as the Work of *Barnabas the Apostle*: and it bears sufficient Testimony to the Belief of our Saviour's Divinity in those early Ages.

* Strom. Lib. ii. P. 373. 410. & alibi.

The Book called *the Shepherd of Hermas* is also of great Antiquity, and is quoted by the same *Clemens* and other ancient Writers. *Hermas* also bears full Testimony to the Divinity of our Saviour. ^a He tells us (agreeably to the Doctrine of *Barnabas* and other ancient Writers) that *the Son is more ancient than any Creature, insomuch that he was in Council with his Father at the Creation of the World.*—And not long after he adds, ^b *The Name of the Son is great, and without Bounds: and the whole World is supported by it, and every Creature of God is sustained by his Son.* ^c But we are told that *Hermas* is one that professedly deals in Visions and Similitudes. This is however plain Doctrine, and what he could never have delivered, even in Vision or Parable, if he had not believed the Eternity of the Son of God. ^d But, it seems, when he speaks plainly, he gives Almighty God no assistant Council, or Associate, in framing the World. How so! ^e He calls upon us to believe that there is one God, who created all things. And so we all profess to believe when we repeat the Nicene Creed. Whether there be three Persons in the Unity of this Godhead, as *Hermas* does not here affirm, so neither does he deny. ^f *Irenæus*, who

^a Lib. iii. Sim. ix. S. 12. ^b Ib. S. 14. ^c Sequel, p. 439.

^d P. 441. ^e Lib. ii. Mand. 1. ^f Lib. iv. 37.

Mr. L. very unluckily here refers us to, quotes this Passage, but he never understood that *Hermas*, by ascribing the Creation of all things to the One God, meant to exclude the Son. For in the Sentence immediately preceding this Quotation he tells us that *the Son, and the Holy Spirit were with God when he created all things, and that he spake to them, saying, Let us make Man after our Image, &c.* " And that *Hermas* was in the same Sentiments appears from the above Quotations.

As to the Testimony of *St. Clement Bishop of Rome*, " it has been already, I hope, sufficiently consider'd, " and so has the Epistle of the Church of *Smyrna*. As to *Polycarp's* Epistle to the *Philippians*, Mr. *Lindsey* has brought nothing from thence any way to his Purpose, unless we will allow that to distinguish the Son from the Father, and to give Titles of Pre-eminence to the Father expressive of that Distinction, is to deny the Divinity of the Son. " On the contrary, both the Passages produced by him prove directly against him. " In the First the Holy Martyr prays for *Grace and Peace* jointly from God the Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ. " In

^m See Bull Def. Fid. Nic. Sect. i. cap. 2. Sect. ii. cap. 2.

ⁿ See above, P. 97. " P. 133. " See Bull Def. Fid. Nic. Sect. ii. cap. 3. " Sect. i. " Sect. xii.

the other he calls our Lord Jesus Christ the eternal High Priest, and prays that the Father, and the Son of God Christ Jesus, would build them up in Faith and Truth. This, * as I observ'd before, is not only a pious Wish, but a Prayer to the Son jointly with the Father, and represents him, as well as the Father, to be the Giver of all good Gifts. And at his Passion, as we have already seen, he address'd a *Doxology* to the Son jointly with the Father. † There is another Passage in this Epistle, where *Poly-carp* thus expresses himself:—*For we are all in the Sight of our Lord and God, and must all stand before the Judgment-Seat of Christ, and shall every one give an Account of himself. Let us therefore serve him with Fear, and with godly Reverence, as he himself hath commanded—Christ* is plainly the Person spoken of throughout; and we are taught that *all things are manifest in his Sight*, and from thence are exhorted to *serve him with Fear, and godly Reverence*. And this will receive Confirmation from a parallel Passage in *Ignatius's Epistle to the Ephesians*. ‡ There is *nothing hid from the Lord, but even our Secrets are nigh unto him. Let us therefore do all things as having him dwelling in us, that we may be his*

* Answ. p. 104.

† Sect. vi.

‡ Sect. xv.

Temple, and he may be our God.—That *Christ* is here spoken of is manifest, not only from the Word *Lord*—by which *Ignatius* usually denotes our *Saviour*, but from the whole Context, which relates to him.

But the Testimony of *Ignatius* comes next to be consider'd. * And this is, I think, the most extraordinary Part of this curious Chapter. * I had produced several Passages from *Ignatius's* Epistles, wherein he asserts in plain Terms the Divinity of *Christ*. What has he to say to these Proofs? Nothing. Can he deny the Truth of my Quotations? No. Can he deny the Pertinence of them, or put any other Sense on these plain Passages? No. Has he, or can he produce any one Passage in these Epistles denying our *Lord's* Divinity, or favouring his own Sentiments? No; not one. All he can say on this Head is, that *Ignatius* frequently asserts that *Christ* was really and truly a *Man*: and so do both the *Nicene*, and *Athanasian* Creeds. What then has he to say? We have two Copies of these Epistles: the larger, allowed by all to be much corrupted, the smaller more genuine; but these too may have receiv'd Alterations. But how shall we discover these Interpolations? There are some Passages in the larger Copy strongly expressive of our *Lord's*

* P. 443.

* Answ. p. 103.

Divinity, which are allowed to be *Interpolations*, as not being found in the lesser Copy; and therefore every thing in these lesser, and genuine Epistles, which teaches the same Doctrine, must be *forg'd* too. And thus by one bold Stroke we get rid at once of the Testimony of *Ignatius*. But it is pleasant to remark that the learned Mr. *Whiston* contended for the Genuineness of these larger Epistles; and that, because he thought they favour'd *Arianism* more than the lesser Copy. And now Mr. *L.* discards, or alters both at pleasure, because he can make neither of them speak his Sentiments. But if this Evasion fails, *Ignatius*, we are told, is a *Writer, whose Style abounds with big swelling Figures of Rhetorick, and Allusions to the mystick oriental Philosophy*: and therefore is not to be depended on, when in plain Terms he calls *Christ our God*, and desires the Brethren to *pray unto Christ* for him: If he calls him *the eternal Word of God*, and says that *he existed with the Father before all Ages*, it is to be interpreted of the Design and Decree of Almighty God, in which Sense all Men are *eternal*; and we all of us, Mr. *Lindsey* and I myself, *existed with God before all Ages*. However, if no other Way will do, we need not scruple to say that *Ignatius* so far deviated from the Doctrine of *Christ*

Christ, and his Apostles. I think we need not desire a fairer Confession that this *Apostolical Father* was no Friend of his. And what becomes then of his bold Assertions, ' that the whole Christian Church in the *Apostolick Age* was entirely Unitarian *, that all Christian People, for upwards of three hundred Years after Christ, were generally Unitarians, what is now call'd either Arian, or Socinian? ' and that it was the universal Practice of the Christian Church, with little or no Variation, for the three first Centuries, to address religious Worship only to the Father? These groundless Assertions, as he can no way defend, so is he not ingenuous enough to retract.

But I shall readily acknowledge, that some learned Men have charg'd the *Ante-Nicene Father* with favouring *Arianism*, and they were not without some prausible Pretences for such Charge, though these Pretences have been fully obviated. But if this were true, it would not serve our *Apologist's* turn. For it is universally allowed, and Mr. L's own Quotations fully prove, that they held the Pre-existence of *Christ* before his *Incarnation*, and address'd religious Worship to him. ' Our *Apologist* tell us, that Dr. Clarke was misled by his Veneration for the Christian Father to embrace this Opinion. The

* Apol. p. 161.

* P. 24.

* P. 147, 148.

† Sequel. p. 332. See Index, p. 502.

same Opinion held Dr. *Whitby*, Mr. *Whiston*, Bp. *Clayton*, and even the learned and able Ben *Mordecai*—These too were all *Worshippers of Christ*. And so was *Arius*, and all the different Sects of his Followers. And so was *Socinus* himself, though he denied *Christ's Pre-existence*. Mr. *L.* * as I told him before, has, I believe, the Honour of being the Author of the first Sect who called themselves *Christians*, and yet denied that any *Worship* was due to *Christ*; and his *Liturgy* is the first *Liturgy*, wherein the *Worship of Christ* was omitted.

* But our *Apologist* whenever he refers to the Ancient Fathers takes Care to put us in Mind that it is by the *Scriptures alone* that theirs, and all other Opinions, concerning *Christ* are to be tried. Herein I agree entirely with him: but then I humbly think that his Opinions have been already weighed in the *Balance of the Sanctuary*, and found wanting. And therefore I hope I may be reasonably excus'd from pursuing the Matter any farther, till he has first replied to what I have said before in my Answer to him. I refered him also to a Treatise of mine, publish'd not many Years since entitled *a Kindication of the Doctrine of the Trinity*, in Answer to the then Bp. of *Clogher*, whether this ever came

* *Ans. P. 162.*

* *Sequel, p. xlii. xlv.*

to his Hands, or whether he thought it not worth his Notice, I know not. I cannot say, as he does of Dr. *Whitby's* Book, that it is to be met with commonly on the Stalls in London. I suppose it may be had by Enquiry at the Book-sellers. In these, and the above Letter, Mr. *Lindsey* may find, if he pleases, every thing that he has advanc'd, answer'd, or obviated. I will beg leave also to refer him to an excellent Sermon by the worthy President of *Magdalen College*, where he may find the *Worship of our Blessed Saviour* vindicated, and establish'd, both from *Scripture*, and *Antiquity*, in as full a Manner, as the Compass of such a Discourse would permit. There has since been publish'd a *Plea for the Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ* by Mr. *Robinson*, one of our dissenting Brethren, fraught with sound Speech that cannot be condemn'd, and setting forth the Difficulties, which all those must be driven to who deny our *Lord's Divinity*, in the most plain, clear, and convincing Manner. After all, what do our *Apologists* Proofs from *Scripture* amount to? He has prov'd that there is *One only God*. And so we all, I hope, believe. But that there cannot be three Persons in the *Unity of the Godhead* he has not prov'd, nor attempted to prove. This he all along takes for granted. He maintains, that

Christ is not the self-existent Being. And who says that he is? We believe him to be *the Son of God, begotten of his Father before all Worlds, very God of very God.* We believe also a Distinction of *Persons* in the *Godhead*, and a Subordination of the *Son* to the *Father*. We farther own, that *Christ*, in his human Nature, and with regard to his mediatorial Capacity, was inferior to the *Father*, and acted as his Delegate, and Messenger. And this is all that the *Scriptures* alledg'd by him prove. This has been already shewn, and the Proofs from *Scripture* of our *Lord's Divinity* have been laid before him. But it is in vain to produce Proofs from *Scripture* to a Man, who by some forc'd Interpretation can explain away the clearest Texts—It may suffice to consider two or three Instances of the strange Liberty, which he takes in interpreting *Scripture*.

St. *John*, in the Beginning of his *Gospel*, tells us that *the Word was with God, and that the Word was God*: and soon after he says, that *the Word was made Flesh*. A common Reader would understand this to signify, that as our *Saviour* appear'd in *the Flesh*, and was truly *Man*, so before his *Incarnation* he was truly *God*: especially as our *Lord* is call'd by the same St. *John* *the Word of Life*, 1 *John*. 1. 1. and *the Word of God*.

God, Rev. xix. 13. * And thus have the Words been commonly understood from the first Ages of Christianity to this Day. But Mr. Lindsey would persuade us that, *the Word*, or *Logos*, is no *Person*. † In his *Apology* he told us that *the Word* was nothing but a Description in the Hebrew way of God himself. According to this Sense of the Expression, St. John must be suppos'd here to say that in the Beginning was God himself, and God himself was with God, and God himself was God. He has now found out another Evasion. ‡ *The Word*, we are told, in Greek signifies Reason, or Wisdom: and he has alledged two or three Passages from the Old Testament, where, as he supposes, *the Word of God* has this Signification. But in neither of these Places is the Word to be understood in this Sense. § The Text Psal. xxxiii. 6.—By the Word of the LORD were the Heavens made—has by some ancient Interpreters been expound-

* See this fully proved in these Papers above, p. 74, &c. and in my Vindie. p. 30, &c. where also this Interpretation of the Text before us is vindicated. † p. 89. ‡ Sequel, p. 116, &c. § *Iren.* L. i. c. 19. L. iii. c. 8. *Hippolyt.* contr. Nov. c. xii. p. 14. *Tertull.* adv. Prax. c. 7. *Origen* in Job. p. 43. *Augst.* Præp. Evang. L. vii. c. 12. L. xi. c. 14. See *Waterland's* Sermons, p. 70. And the same Fathers, interpret. Prov. viii. of the Son of God. See *Waterland's* Sermons, p. 241, my Vindie. part i. p. 43, &c.

ed of *the Son of God*: I should rather think that the *Psalmist* refers to *Gen. i. 3—God said—Let there be Light and there was Light.* ¹ As to *Psal. cv. 19. the Word of the Lord* signifies the prophetic Word of *Joseph*: and accordingly in the *Septuagint Version* it is translated—*τὸ λόγιον τοῦ κυρίου.* Nor does—*Λόγος*—ever, as I remember signify *Wisdom* in *Scripture*. This Interpretation is indeed no new one. It was devis'd by the *Sabellians* of old, and reviv'd of late Years by *Mr. Le Clerc*, and adopted by *Mr. Lardner*: ² and is fully confuted by *Dr. Waterland*, as it had been long before by ³ *Tertullian*, ⁴ *Epiphanius*, and others.

But let us see what Sense this Interpretation makes—*In the Beginning was Wisdom—very true—and Wisdom was with God—most undoubtedly—and Wisdom was God—How so?* *God* is said to be *Light*, by an easy and natural Figure, because he is a *God* of infinite Purity. *God is Love*, because he aboundeth in *Love* and *Mercy*. But to say that *Love is God*, or that *Wisdom is God*, is a Phraseology I never met with. Besides it makes a double Tautology. *Wisdom was in the Beginning with God, and God was wise.* And then we have it again repeated:

¹ See *Hammond* Annor.

² Sermon on *Jeb. i. 1.*

³ *Adv. Prax. Cap. 20, 21.*

⁴ *Hæres. lxy. p. 608, 9.*

The same Wisdom was in the Beginning with God.
 * What follows, if understood of a Person, is plain, and easy: Every common Reader will understand that our *Saviour* is the Person here spoken of; that he existed *from the Beginning*, and that *all things were created by him*, and that he came to give *Life*, and impart Knowledge to Mankind. It requires no small Skill to give a different Sense to the Words. * And by a little Knowledge of the Heresies, which then prevail'd, we shall not only see the Meaning; but shall be able to account for the Reason, and Propriety of every Expression. Again, what follows after v. 7th plainly denotes a *Person*.—*John came to bear Witness of the Light*.—What, or who, did he come to bear Witness to?—*Jesus Christ*.—v. 15, 34.—Ch. iii. 26. Again, *He was not that Light*.—The Evangelist can not be suppos'd to mean that *John was not the Wisdom of God*. The Word *Light* must here denote a *Person*. And by that *Person* we are here told that *the World was made*, by the same whom *John came to bear Witness to*. * And here Mr. *Lindsey*, and his Principal *Le Clerc* are greatly distress'd. This—*and*—is sometimes—*He*—and sometimes—*She*—*He* whom *John bare*

* See above p. 77. *Waterland*. Import. Doct. Trin. p. 254, &c.

* See above, p. 81.

* Sequel, p. 134.

Witness

*Witness to, was the promis'd Messiah: but—She—Wisdom—made the World. Again v. 14.—*ὁ Λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο—*Wisdom was made Flesh, that is, says Mr. Lindsey, the Wisdom of God resided in the Man Christ Jesus.—But by what Rules of Grammar, or Criticism, can σὰρξ ἐγένετο—be construed—residing in a Man? It follows,—and we beheld his Glory—the Glory of the Λόγος—the Glory as of the Only-begotten of the Father.—But the divine Attribute of Wisdom could not be said to be begotten of God, much less to be his Only-begotten. The Terms Father and Son plainly denote two distinct Persons. But here Mr. L. shuffles. He would transpose the Words, and would join the Expression αὐτὸν καὶ τὴν δόξαν from the Father with the Word Glory, which St. John joins with—Only-begotten—If this were allowed him, yet he cannot deny that our Saviour is here call'd the Only-begotten: and if so, he must be the Person spoken of throughout the Verse, the Logos, or Word, and that Word was God. But we are told that—μωυζαῖος—signifies only most beloved. Isaac, it seems, is called Abraham's Only-begotten Son. But why? not because he was his best-beloved Son, but because he was really his only Son by his Wife Sarah, the Heir of the Promise. 'The Word—μωυζαῖος—al-*

ways in *Scripture*, and I believe in other Authors, signifies an *only-begotten Son*. Our *Apolo-
gist* goes no farther than this 14th Verse. What follows is plainly relative to the Person of *Jesus Christ*, who again at the 18th Verse is called *the Only-begotten Son, which is in the Bosom of the Father*. And in another Place St. *John* tells us that *God sent his Only-begotten Son into the World*. He was therefore *the Son of God*, before he was sent into the World: and the Title of *Only-begotten Son* plainly distinguishes him from all Creatures.

I have had frequent Occasion to observe what an Injury it is to the sacred Writers to suppose them to express themselves in such an ambiguous, and figurative Style. This holds still more strongly against our *Apolo-
gist's* Scheme. If *Jesus Christ* had been a mere *Man* commission'd by *God*, no tolerable Reason can be given why St. *John* should prefix this pompous Introduction to his *Gospel*. It surely would have been sufficient to say—*There was a Man sent from God, who came to bear Witness to the promis'd Messiah*—And there was another *Man*, the *Son of Joseph and Mary*, who was endowed with a greater Measure of Wisdom and Grace, and

* 1. John iv. 9. See also *Joh. iii. 16, 18.* * See *Bull*
Jud. Eccl. Cath. c. v. *Pearson* on the Creed. p. 105, &c.

who

who came to make a more perfect Revelation of *God's Will*. Or if the *Evangelist* had thought proper to speak of the *Creation* of the World by the *Supreme God*, in Opposition to those, who ascrib'd it to some inferiour Being, he would not have so express'd himself as would naturally lead Men into the very Error he is suppos'd to combat. For it has been generally inferr'd from this very Passage that our *Lord* was the *Creator* of all things: and yet Mr. *Lindsey* would perswade us that he was a mere Man who never existed before he was born into the World. In the poetical, and prophetic, Parts of *Scripture* we often meet with lofty, and figurative Language: 'and our *Lord* himself was sometimes oblig'd by the Prejudice of the *Jews* to speak to them in *Proverbs*, and *Parables*. But when the *Gospel* was fully publish'd it was surely Time to *Speak plainly*. Nor can we suppose that St. *John* should preface a plain historical Relation of our *Saviour's* Actions on Earth with such a mystical Preface, as could answer no End, but to puzzle, and mislead Mankind. As to what Mr. *L.* has offer'd in Support of his Interpretation, it may be sufficient to refer to what I have said before in these

* *Job*. xvi. 25.

Papers, and in my Vindication, where I apprehend all he has said is fully obviated.

Another plain Text which our Apologist has strangely misinterpreted is *Job. viii. 58—Before Abraham was I am.*—^v Here the *Remarker* has employed a great deal of Learning to shew that *the Present Tense is a Tense of all Times*, and is often us'd to express the past Time. ^u But this is all lost upon Mr. *Lindsey*. He chooses to adopt the Interpretation of *Socinus*, and tells us that when *Christ* said *I am he*, he did not mean that he actually existed before *Abraham*, but only in the *Destination, and Appointment of God, to whom all live*. I, who am no Adept in the *Cabala of Socinianism*, cannot understand such strange Interpretations of *Scripture*. *Herod*, and *Pontius Pilate*, might have said the same. For they also liv'd to God before they were brought into Being. ^w And they did no other than what his *Hand, and his Counsel, determined before to be done*. Nor can I comprehend what Answer this was to the Question ask'd by the *Jews—Thou art not yet fifty Years old, and hast thou seen Abraham?* I wish Mr. *Lindsey* would well consider the shocking Consequences of this his Interpretation. It not only makes our *Blessed*

^v P. 33, &c.

^u P. 224.

^w Acts iv. 28.

Saviour give an impertinent Answer to an *impertinent Question*, but it puts a Lye in his Mouth. It makes him say one thing, and mean another. He says what he knew the *Jews* would understand, and what they actually did understand, as declaring his *Pre-existence before Abraham*: at the same Time reserving another Meaning to himself, that he was *fore-ordin'd* to his Office *before Abraham*. And accordingly the *Jews* did so understand him, and *took up Stones to cast at him*. Nor was his Meaning unintelligible only to the *Jews*, but has been so to all *Christians* ever since. * They have all understood these Words, as setting forth the *Pre-existence of Christ*. This new sense of the Words is, I believe, scarce older than *Socinus's* Time. † I had in my Answer to him sufficiently, as I thought, set forth the Absurdity of this new Interpretation: but he does not vouchsafe to take any Notice of what I said; but advances the same absurd Comment with

* *Justin Martyr*. Apol. II. p. 95, 96. *Iren.* Lib. iv. c. 27. *Orig.* contra *Cels.* Lib. viii. p. 381. *Novat.* de Trin. c. 23. *Novatian's* Words are indeed very remarkable—*Si homo tantummodo Christus, quomodo inquit, Ante Abraham ego sum—* And *mentitur igitur, & fallit, si ante Abraham non fuit qui ex Abraham fuit, aut non fallit, si etiam Deus est, dum ante Abraham fuit.*

† P. 39, 40. See also *Whitby. Maldonat.* Annot.

donat. Annot.

equal Confidence, without any Reply, and scarce any new Proof to support it. The only thing I can find offer'd in Proof of it is that the Words—*I am*—in other Parts of *Scripture* signify—*I am the Christ*.—But this does not come up to the Point. It is quite a different thing to say—*I am the Christ*—and *I was of old destin'd and appointed of God to be the Christ*.—The Truth is—*Εγώ εἰμι*—*I am*— is an elliptical Proposition, and, * as *Grotius* has before observ'd, the Sense must be supplied from what went before. In *Mar.* xiii. 6. *Luk.* xxi. 8. the Context shews it to be—*I am the Christ*. *Job.* iv. 26.—*I am the Messiah*. *Job.* xviii. 5.—*I am Jesus of Nazareth*. *John* viii. 24.—*I am the Light of the World*. *Job.* vi. 20.—*I am Jesus*. *Matt.* xxvi. 22.—*Am I the Traytor?*—But in the Place before us the Context determines the Sense otherwise, and obliges us to interpret it of the *Pre-existence of Christ*. It is an Answer to the Question of the *Jews*, who said unto him, *Thou art not yet fifty Years old, and hast thou seen Abraham?*

Our Lord has been generally thought in his Answer to refer to the Speech of God to *Moses*—*I am that I am*—But our *Apologist*, not only

* Annot. in *Joh.* viii. 24.

denies this, but will not allow that Text to have been either rightly translated, or rightly understood. It should be, he says, translated—*I will be that I will be*, and signifies no more than—*I will perform what I have promis'd.*—
 * But does he not know that in the *Hebrew* Language the *Future* Tense is often put for the *Present*? that the Verb—יהיה—or הוה—signifies not to *fulfil Promises*, but to *exist*, that—איהיה—and—יהוה—the proper Name of God, are Words of the same Import, only one is in the first Person, the other in the third: that this Speech of *God* to *Moses* is by the *Septuagint* translated—ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ ὢν—and is allowed by all Writers, ancient and modern, *Jewish* as well as *Christian*, to denote the *Eternity* and

* See *Buxtorf* Lexicon, *Robertson* Thesaurus, *Taylor's* Concordance, *Drusius* de Nom. Tetragramm. *Fuller* Miscell. Sacr. L. ii. c. 6. *Patrick*, *Ainsworth*, *Fagius*, *Vatablus*, *Clavius*, *Fran.* *Junius* Annot. *Maimon.* *More Nevocchim.* p. i. c. 62, *Phil. Jud.* p. 184, 614. *Just. Mart.* ad Græc. Exhort. p. 23, 24. *Clem. Alexand.* *Pædagog.* L. i. c. 118. *Strom.* L. v. p. 562. *Novat.* de Trin. c. vi. *Euseb.* *Præpar. Evang.* L. xi. c. 9, 11. *Demonst. Evang.* L. ix. c. 7. *Pearson* on the Creed, p. 147. *Waterland* 1st Def. p. 57, &c. *Knight's* Script. Doct. p. 133. Second Letter to the Author of Hist. of Montan. p. 2, &c. *Univ. Hist.* vol. i. p. 486. and *Shuckford* Connect. vol. ii. p. 434, &c.

† The *Vulgate* Version renders it *Ego sum qui sum*; the *Arabick* *Æternus qui non præterit.*

necessary

necessary Existence of God? Nor will the Text allow of this new Interpretation. The Words are *God's Answer to Moses*, who had desir'd of *God* to know by what *Name* he should call him. And this is the *Name* given. It follows—*Thou shalt say unto the Children of Israel—I AM hath sent me unto you.*—*I AM* therefore is plainly the *Name* of the Person who sent *Moses*, the same who in the next Verse, and in other Places, is called *Yehovah*, 'a Word of the same Import, and Derivation. But what Sense will *Mr. Lindsey* make of, *I will be what I will be?*—This he tells us signifies—*I will perform that I have promis'd.*—He may with equal Reason affix any other Sense to the words, the direct contrary, if he pleases. For he brings no Proof, nor Authority, nor any parallel Passage. All he produces is a Note from *Mr. Le Clerc*, who gives a very different Sense of the Words. But he quotes ' *Eusebius*, as saying that the *Septuagint* Translators borrow'd their Interpretation of the Text from the *Platonick* Philosophers: whereas *Eusebius*, in the Place cited, says the direct contrary. Not a Word is there in *Eusebius* about the *Septuagint*

' See the Authors above-cited,
L. xi. c. 9.

' *Præpar. Evangel.*

Translators: on the contrary he tells us that *Plato* borrowed his Doctrine of the necessary Existence of God from this Passage of *Moses*. * And this too he tells us is the Reason why the Word—*Ei*—was written over the Door of the *Delphick* Temple, for which he quotes *Plutarch*, whose Treatise on this Subject we have still extant, There we read—*We say unto God—Ei—Thou art—attributing to him the proper, true, and sole Appellation of Being, as agreeing to him alone.—And again—God, we must say—I S—and he is not according to any Time, but according to Eternity, which is immoveable, and without Time, or Change, in which there is nothing first, or last;—but being one it has fill'd it's eternal Duration with one perpetual Now. And that only Is, which is really according to this, neither past, nor future, nor beginning, nor ending.—*However I am not unwilling to admit in part *Mr. L's* Interpretation. The ancient Interpreters above referr'd to tell us, that the Time past, present, and to come, are all express'd in this Word, and that it denotes God to be necessarily existent, eternal, always and every where the same; immutable in his Nature, and faithful in his Promises. And accordingly in *Scripture* God says of himself—*I am He. I am*

* *Ib.* c. 11.† *Is.* xlviii. 12.

the First, I also am the Last. " I am Alpha and Omega, the Beginning, and the End; which is, and which was, and which is to come. " Farther, that the Son of God was the Person who appear'd to Moses, I have, as I think, sufficiently shewn in my Answer and that what is spoken of Jehovah in the Old Testament, is applied to Christ in the New. And therefore. we may reasonably suppose that, when our Lord says of himself—I Am—he refers to this Passage in Exodus. And accordingly he says in his own Person, ' I am the First and the Last—' I am Alpha and Omega, the Beginning, and the Ending, which is, and which was, and which is to come. ' And his Apostle tells us that he is the same yesterday, and to day, and for ever.

It will, I hope, be sufficient to take Notice of one Text more^m, on which our Apologist has bestowed much Pains, and many Words; and that is Coloss. i. 16, 17. " I have in these Papers insisted on this Text as a full Proof that *our Saviour is the Creator of all things.* But I find

^s Rev. xxi. 6.

^h P. 12, &c. See also my Vindic.

Part ii. p. 49, &c.

ⁱ Rev. i. 11, 17. ii. 8. xxii. 13.

^k Rev. i. 8, 11. See the Application of this Text to our Saviour vindicated from Objections by Dr. Waterland, Sermons, p. 227. &c. Second Def. p. 241, &c.

^l Heb. xii. 8.

^m P. 455, &c.

ⁿ See above p. 30.

my Proofs were not rightly levell'd : I did not know who I had to deal with ; not with an *Arian*, or *Socinian*, but—I was going to say—a *Sadducee*. But I would not overcharge him : he does seem to believe there are such things as *Angels*, and *Spirits*. * What then does he mean when he tells us that *what is spoken by Christ, and his Apostles, of Angels, good or bad, is spoken according to the popular Opinion, and not the Reality of the thing, purely in Accommodation to the Ideas of the Jews, and Gentiles, of those Days?* But if the Language of the Scripture is so highly bold, and figurative, what am I to believe?—How am I to distinguish * *what Parts of Scripture are the Word of God, and what merely the Invention and Embellishment of the Writers?* What Rule of Faith must the common People have? and how shall we maintain the Clearness and Intelligibility of the *Scriptures* against the *Romanists*? Certain it is that not only the common People, but the Learned of all Ages, have believ'd on the Authority of *Christ*, and his *Apostles*, that there are such Beings as *Devils*, and that there is one among them, who is called *the Prince of the Devils*; and that they have Power to tempt and to hurt, Mankind.

* P. 463, 466.

* See p. 458.

And,

* And, as to the Text before us, the ancient Writers infer from this, and other Passages of Scripture, that *by the Son of God were all things created.* I shall cite only one Passage from Irenæus, which is very full to our Purpose,—

Nec quicquam ex his quæ constituta sunt, & in subjectione sunt, comparabitur Verbo Dei, per quem facta sunt omnia, qui est Dominus noster Jesus Christus. Quoniam enim sive Angeli, sive Archangeli, sive Throni, sive Dominationes, ab eo qui super omnes est Deus, & constituta sunt, & facta sunt per Verbum ejus—ita ut is quidem qui omnia fecerit cum Verbo suo jussu dicatur Deus & Dominus solus, quæ autem facta sunt, non jam ejusdem vocabuli participabilia esse, neque jussu id vocabulum sumere debere, quod est Creatoris.

Creation is indeed here ascrib'd to the Son of God in the most full, and expressive Terms. The Apostle seems to have taken Care to guard against all Evasion. *By him* he says *were all things created*: not only this *Earth* on which we dwell, but *all things that are in Heaven* as well as *on Earth*: not only the *heavenly Bodies*, which fall within our Observation, but *all things visible and invisible*: all intelligent Beings, even

* See Bull Def. Fid. Nic. Sect. i. c. 2. *Waterland* Sermon on *Joh. i. 3.*

* Lib. iii. c. 8. See also *Tertull. contr. Marc. c. xix. Novat. de Trin. c. 14.*

those of the highest Ranks, and Orders, *whether they be Thrones, or Dominions, or Principalities, or Powers : they were created, not only by him, but for him. And he is before all things : and by him all things consist.* But no Words whatsoever can guard against Socinian Subtlety. If St. John says that *by the Word all things were made,* we are told that the *Word was no Person, but the Wisdom of God.* If St. Paul teaches us that *by the Son of God were all things created,* this Evasion will not serve : but they have another ready. * They tell us, that *the original Creation of all things is not here spoken of, but a new Creation, and Regulation of Mankind.* I may answer in the Words of Dr. Clarke, * *Nothing can be more forc'd and unnatural than the Socinian's Interpretation of this Passage, who understand it figuratively of the new Creation by the Gospel.—* To the same Purpose speaks Mr. Peirce in his Comment—*The Interpretation which refers what is here said of our Saviour to the new Creation, or Renovation of all things, is so forc'd and violent, that it can hardly be thought that Men would have ever espoused it, but for the Sake of an Hypothesis. The Reader may meet with a Confutation of it in most Commentators.—* There are

* P. 479, 480.

* Script. Doctr. Trin. n. 550.

indeed

indeed scarce any Words but what are used sometimes in an improper, or figurative, Sense. The Reformation of Mankind, and the Conversion of a Sinner, is sometimes in *Scripture* by a beautiful Figure called *Creation*, because of the Greatness of the Change, and the mighty Power of *God* in effecting it. But the Words will not bear that Sense here. For *all things in Heaven and Earth* are here said to have been created by him. Now this is the very Expression, which is used in *Scripture* for the *Creation* of the World by *God Almighty*. And by this Expression good Men of old set forth the Power and Sovereignty of *God*.

" Again, by him were created all things that are in Heaven, and that are in Earth, visible and invisible. But the heavenly Bodies, the Sun, Moon, and Stars, underwent no new Regulation: and the Angels, who never laps'd, needed no *Renovation*. It must therefore be their original *Creation*, which is here spoken of, and ascrib'd to the Son of *God*. And accordingly Mr. *Lindsey* very prudently passes over in Silence this latter Clause—*visible and invisible*.

" Gen. i. 1. ii. 4. Exod. xx. 11. xxxi. 17. 2 Kings xix. 15. 2 Chron. ii. 12. Neb. ix. 6. Psal. cxv. 15. cxxi. 2. cxxiv. 8. cxxxiv. 3. cxlvi. 6. Is. xlii. 5. Jer. xxxii. 17. Acts iv. 24. xiv. 15, Rev. x. 6. xiv. 7.

¶ But he tells us, that *by Heaven and Earth the best Interpreters understand all Mankind, Jew and Gentile.* This I cannot but think a very forced Interpretation, and not warranted by the Passages referr'd to. I am sensible indeed that the learned Dr. *Hammond* puts this Sense upon this Phrase at the twentieth Verse of this Chapter, and also in the parallel Passages in the Epistle to the *Ephesians*. * And Mr. *Locke*, though he gives us another Interpretation, yet speaks of this with some Approbation. But I can see no Reason to depart from the natural, and usual Signification of the Words. These Passages will admit of an easy Interpretation, if we consider that our *Saviour*, when he ascended up into *Heaven*, told his * *Apostles* that *all Power was given unto him in Heaven, and in Earth*: that St. *Paul* tells us that * *God hath highly exalted him, and given him a Name, which is above every Name, that at the Name of Jesus, every Knee should bow, of things in Heaven, and things in Earth, and things under the Earth*; and again that * *God rais'd Christ from the Dead, and set him at his own Right Hand in the heavenly Places, far above all Principality, and Power,*

* P. 464, 479, 480.

* Comment. on *Eph.* i. 10.

† *Matth.* xxviii. 18.

* *Phil.* ii. 9, 10.

* *Eph.* i.

20, 21. See also 1 *Pe.* iii. 22.

and

λ

and Might, and Dominion. Let us farther consider that *Christ* is not only the *Head of the Church,* ^b but also the *Head of all Principality and Power*; and that under him, as one common *Head*, the Saints on Earth, and Angels, and Saints, in Heaven, are united in one Body, and Fellowship. ^c The Apostle represents *Christians* as admitted into the *City of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable Company of Angels, to the general Assembly, and Church of the First-born, which are written in Heaven.* ^d And accordingly we find that the heavenly *Angels* concern themselves in the Work of our Redemption; ^e they *rejoice at the Conversion of a Sinner,* ^f and *minister to them, who are Heirs of Salvation.* These things, I say, being consider'd, and these Passages of *Scripture* compar'd together, we shall not be at a Loss to understand *St. Paul's* Meaning *Eph.* iii. 10, where he tells us, *that now unto the Principalities and Powers in heavenly Places might be known by the Church the manifold Wisdom of God.*—This *Dr. Hammond* thus paraphrases—*That by what is now done in the Church the very Angels may now come to know, that which before they knew not, the great Variety of*

^b Col. ii. 10.

^c Heb. xii. 22, 23.

^d 1 Pet. i. 12.

^e Luk. xv. 10.

^f Heb. i. 14. See also Luk. ii. 13. Matt.

xviii. 10, 1 Tim. iii. 16.

God's

God's wise dispensing of things.—And in like Manner Dr. *Whitby*, *Grotius*, and most other Commentators expound it. Nor will the Words well bear any other Signification. St. *Paul* also in the second Chapter of this Epistle, v. 5. &c. compares the Conversion of the *Heathen* to the *Resurrection* from the Dead: and in Allusion to this he says that *God hath rais'd us up together, and made us sit together in heavenly Places in Christ Jesus*. Here—ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις—may either signify the *heavenly State of Christians* in Comparison to their former State of *Heathenism*; or rather that we are hereby admitted into Fellowship with the *Saints and Angels in Heaven*. For so—ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις—signifies Ch. i. 20. From hence too we may understand the *Apostle's* Meaning Ch. iii. 15. where he tells us that of *Christ the whole Family in Heaven and Earth is nam'd*. † On which Place *Grotius* tells us that it was common for the *Jews* to call *Angels, and good Men, the superior, and inferior, Family of God*, who both acknowledged *Christ* for their *Head*. To the same Purpose *Grotius* interprets Ch. i. 10, where *God* is said to gather together in one all things in *Christ*, both which are in *Heaven*, and which are on *Earth*.—ἀναμιγαλῶσα—*to unite together under one Head*, even

† See also *Whitby* and *Zanchius*.

Christ, not only *Jew* and *Gentile*, but *all the Inhabitants of Heaven*. And this will help to illustrate, and explain, the parallel Passage, *Col. i. 20.* where *God* is said by *Christ* to reconcile all things, not—*ἑαυτῷ*—but—*εἰς αὐτόν*—This, as *Gratius* observes, signifies—under him—the same as—*ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ*—in the parallel Passage. * And—*ἀποκαταλλάξαι*—signifies to reconcile and make Friends one with another. Our *Reconciliation to God* is spoken of in the following Verses. † The Meaning then I take to be is that *Christ* by his *Death* hath not only reconcil'd us to *God*, but to one another. He hath not only reconcil'd both *Jew* and *Gentile* unto *God* in one Body by the *Cross*: but *Angels* are thereby reconcil'd to us, of our Enemies become our Friends united with us in one Body under *Christ*, and ready to perform all friendly Offices to us. *Dr. Hammond* indeed supposes *Heaven and Earth* in these Texts of *Scripture* to signify no more than all Mankind both *Jew* and *Gentile*; but herein he differs from most other Commentators: whether he, or they, be in the right, let now the intelligent Reader judge. But the same *Dr. Hammond* finds himself oblig'd by the Context to interpret the same

* So say all the Lexicons, *Scapula*, *Stephens*, *Suidas*, *Hesychius*, *Phavorinus*.

† See *Whitby*, *Pearce*, *Zanchius*.

Phrase in the Text before us Col. i. 16. of *Angels* as well as *Men*, and so does ^a Mr. *Locke*, and also *Grotius*, and all the Commentators in general—*Grotius* on *Eph.* i. 21, thus speaks. *Intelligent quidam de imperiis terrenis, sed locus Coloss. i. 16, et quod hic infra est—iii. 10.—convin-* cit agi hic de eximiis *Angelorum* classibus.—And Dr. *Hammond* says that it will be most reasonable in this Place to interpret it in the greater Extent to comprehend *Angels*, and *Men* too; thereby to set out the eternal Divinity, and Power of *Christ*, who is *Creatour* of all.

But what shall we say to the *Thrones*, and *Dominions*, *Principalities* and *Powers*. ¹ The *Apostle*, we are told, borrowed this Language from the Traditions of the *Jews*, without any certain Knowledge of the Matter himself.—And for this he quotes *Zanchius*, an eminent Protestant Divine, who liv'd about the Time of the Reformation. And he might have quoted from him a full Confutation of all that he has here advanc'd. *Zanchius*, in the Place referr'd to, proves at large the Divinity of our Saviour from this very Passage: and tells us, that by *Thrones* and *Dominions*, &c. are meant different Orders of *Angels*. He does indeed say that St.

^a Comment. on *Eph.* i. 20.
and *Zanchius*.

¹ See *Whitby*, *Peirce*

Paul had no distinct Knowledge of these Orders, and that he made Use of such Names, as they were call'd by among the *Jews*. Let us suppose then that *St. Paul* borrow'd these Terms from the *Jews*, or took such as were used to signify different Principalities among the *Heathen* World, yet it must be allowed that he meant hereby different Ranks of Angels. This, if there could be any Doubt about it, might be made appear by comparing this Text with *Rom. viii. 38.—Eph. i. 21.—iii. 10.—vi. 12.—1 Pet. iii. 22.—** *St. Paul* was no *Sadducee*, but a *Pharisee*, and believ'd, I presume, as they did, and all reasonable Men must do, that there are in the Scale of Being different Orders of Intelligences superior to Man, *Angels and Spirits*, some of lower, and some of higher Rank. And he here in plain Terms teaches us that all these, from the lowest to the highest, however they may be distinguish'd, or by whatever Names they may be called, *were created by the Son of God*.¹ But let us on the other Hand suppose that *St. Paul* was wiser than his Countrymen, and full as wise as *Mr. Lindsey*, and believ'd nothing of this *imaginary Hierarchy of Angels, and invisible Powers*, yet 'tis confess'd

* *Aa* xxiii. 6, &c.

¹ *P.* 472.

that he wrote to *Jews*, and *Gentiles*, who did hold such Opinions. And therefore they could not but understand him to mean that all these *invisible Powers*, and *Angels*, were created by the *Son of God*, by him, and for him: and *St. Paul* must know that they would so understand him. — Our *Apologist* is very angry with the worthy *Dean of Gloucester* for accusing the *Socinian System*, as representing the *sacred Writers* to be such very bad Men, as not to be worthy of any *Credit*, or *Esteem*, on account of their manifest and bare-fac'd *Falshoods*. But I desire to know how he would vindicate, not *St. Paul*, but himself and his own *System*. That the *World* was created by *Christ* he holds to be a manifest *Falshood*: and yet he would persuade us that *St. Paul* uses such Language to his Converts, as according to their Notions they could not but understand in this Sense. It follows undeniably, either that *St. Paul* was a very bad, or at least a very weak, Man, or that *Mr. Lindsey's* System is a most false and absurd one: I hope he will choose the latter part of this Dilemma.

And I must again beseech him to reflect what Injury he himself offers to the *sacred Writers*, by charging them with using such bold and figurative Language, as was naturally

calculated to lead those, who they wrote to, and all *Christians* since, into an hurtful Error, and that in a Point of the utmost Importance. By this means * (says an ingenious Writer) *the Socinians have not taken Mystery out of the Scripture: they have only changed its Place: They have taken Mystery out of the Doctrine of Scripture, where it was venerable, and worthy the Majesty of God: and they have placed it in the Phrase of the Scripture, where it is opprobrious, and repugnant to God's Sincerity.*

This Appendix has run out to a Length beyond what I expected: all I shall say more to our *Apologist* is to recommend to him the good Advice,[†] which he gives us from Dr. *Whitchcot*, that he would *read the Scripture, as a Man would read a Letter from a Friend, in the which he doth only look after what was his Friend's Mind and Meaning; not what he can put upon his Words.*

* Dr. *Young's* Sermons, Vol. II. Sermon. ii. p. 78.

† Pref. p. xii.

INDEX of TEXTS Explain'd or Referr'd to in this Letter, and the Answer to Mr. *Lindsey*.

I denotes Answer. II Letter.

GENESIS.

Chap.	Ver.		Pag.
i.	1	—	I. 7. II. 187
—	3	—	II. 172
—	26	—	II. 160
ii.	4	—	II. 187
iii.	19	—	II. 21
v.	3	—	46
xii.	8	—	I. 80
xiii.	4	—	80
xvii.	1	—	15
xviii.	1, &c.	—	13, 15.
—	23, &c.	—	16
xxviii.	10	—	16
—	12	—	20
—	20	—	21
xxxi.	11	—	20
—	13	—	16
xxxii.	9	—	21
xxxv.	7, 11.	—	21
xlvi.	2	—	15
—	16	—	20

EXODUS.

iii.	14	—	I. 39. II. 180, &c.
iv.	16	—	II. 69
vii.	1	—	I. 26. II. 69
xx.	11	—	II. 187
xxx.	6, 7	—	I. 16
xxxi.	17	—	II. 187
xl.	34	—	I. 13

LEVITICUS.

I N D E X.

LEVITICUS.

Chap.	Ver.	Pag.
xvi.	2, &c. —	I. 16

NUMBERS.

xi.	5 —	II. 93
-----	-----	--------

DEUTERONOMY.

vi.	4 —	I. 7
viii.	2, 15 —	I. 13
xxii.	15 —	I. 13

1 SAMUEL.

iv.	4 —	II. 52
-----	-----	--------

2 SAMUEL.

vi.	2 —	I. 14, 15, II. 52
xxiii.	3 —	I. 19

1 KINGS.

viii.	10, 11 —	I. 19
	39 —	II. 28
xviii.	24 —	I. 80

2 KINGS.

xix.	15 —	I. 16, II. 52, 80, 187
------	------	------------------------

1 CHRONICLES.

xvi.	4 —	I. 16
	36 —	II. 79
xxix.	10 —	II. 79

2 CHRONICLES.

ii.	12 —	II. 187
-----	------	---------

NEHEMIAH.

ix.	6 —	II. 73, 187
-----	-----	-------------

JOB.

xxvi.	7 —	II. 80
xxxviii.	7 —	II. 6, 51

PSALMS.

xix.	1 —	II. 80
xxiv.	10 —	I. 15

PSALMS.

INDEX

PSALMS.

Chap.	Ver.		Pag.
xxxiii.	6	—	171
xli.	13	—	73
xlv.	6	—	150
l.	1	—	16
—	14	—	16
lxviii.	17	—	52
lxxvi.	2	—	12
lxxix.	6	—	80
lxxx.	16, &c.	—	52
lxxxi.	18	—	80
lxxxii.	6, 7	—	69
—	18, 19	—	52
lxxxviii.	86	—	15
lxxxix.	11, 12	—	80
—	52	—	73
xcvi.	5	—	51, 80
xcvii.	5, 9	—	51
xcix.	1	—	14, 52
—	6	—	80
cv.	1	—	80
cix.	6	—	80
cx.	1	—	9
cxv.	13	—	187
cxvi.	4, 17	—	80
cxvii.	2	—	187
cxviii.	8	—	187
cxviii.	7	—	187
cxvi.	6	—	187

ECCLESIASTES.

xli.	7	—	II. 71
------	---	---	--------

ISAIAH.

vi.	1, &c.	—	I. 14, 15, 75
—	—	—	II. 7, 51
vii.	14	—	I. 16
viii.	13, 14	—	I. 16
ix.	6	—	I. 16
xi.	25, 26	—	II. 80
xlii.	5	—	II. 80, 187
xlii.	4	—	II. 79
xli.	12	—	II. 80
—	14	—	II. 150
—	22, 23	—	II. 93

ISAIAH.

I N D E X.

ISAIAH.

Chap.	Ver.	Pag.
xlvi.	12 — — —	II. 182
lxiv.	7 — — —	I. 80

JEREMIAH.

x.	11, 12 — —	II. 80
—	24 — —	I. 80
xxxii.	17 — —	II. 187

LAMENTATIONS.

iii.	54 — —	I. 80
------	--------	-------

EZEKIEL.

i.	1, &c. — —	I. 75
—	26 — —	I. 14

DANIEL.

vii.	9, &c — —	I. 14, 75
—	14 — —	II. 71

HOSEA.

iii.	4 — —	I. 81
------	-------	-------

JOB.

ii.	32 — —	I. 80
-----	--------	-------

ZACHARIAH.

xi.	12, 13 — —	I. 18
xiii.	9 — —	I. 80

MALACHI.

iii.	1 — —	I. 17
------	-------	-------

MATTHEW.

i.	23 — —	I. 16. II. 7, 93
iii.	9 — —	I. 17
—	16 — —	II. 104
—	17 — —	I. 27. II. 33
iv.	11 — —	II. 53
viii.	2, &c — —	I. 26
ix.	2 — —	I. 26
—	4 — —	II. 27
v.	18 — —	I. 25

MATTHEW.

INDEX

MATTHEW.

Chap.	Ver.	Pag.
vii.	29	I. 25
ix.	6	I. 25
xi.	10	II. 7
xii.	25	II. 25
xiv.	33	I. 21, 46
xvi.	16	II. 41
xvi.	27	25
xvii.	5	23
xviii.	10	II. 189
xviii.	20	47
xxii.	44	9
xxiv.	30	15
xxv.	31	13, 25
xxvi.	27, 38	II. 21
—	24	II. 170
—	63, 64	I. 21
xxvii.	9, 10	I. 18
xxviii.	2, 26	II. 53, 134
—	18, 19	I. 46, 188

MARK.

i.	2, 3	I. 17
—	27	26
ii.	3	26
ii.	5, 6	31
iv.	30	26
v.	8	26
—	41	26
iii.	6	27
—	46	II. 3
iiii.	6	179
—	38	20
xiv.	61	72
xvi.	19	103

LUKE.

i.	33	II. 71
ii.	9	104
—	13, 14	52, 189
—	32	I. 14
iii.	4	17
vii.	12	II. 174

D d

LUKE.

INDEX

LUKE.

Chap.	Ver.	Page.
vii.	14	I. 26
viii.	43	II. 174
ix.	26	I. 15
—	38	II. 174
—	47	I. 71. II. 27
—	51	II. 105
xxi.	8	172
xxii.	43	53, 104
—	70	I. 27, 70
xxiii.	46	74

JOHN.

i.	1, &c.	I. 7, 97, 137
—	—	II. 10, 74
—	3	II. 7, 44, 171
—	12	II. 6
—	14	I. 14, 27, 137
—	—	II. 5, 10, 56
—	18	I. 27. II. 5, 33, 89
—	23	17
—	34, 49	21, 41
—	51	25
ii.	24, 25	II. 7, 27. I. 71
iii.	13	I. 25
—	14	I. 74
—	16, &c.	I. 27, 74. II. 5, 21, 175
iv.	26	II. 179
v.	17, &c.	I. 27
—	18	21
—	23	23
—	31	II. 65
vi.	3, 8	I. 25
—	20	II. 179
—	62	I. 25
—	64	I. 71. II. 27
—	69	I. 21
viii.	24	II. 38, 179
—	51	I. 38
—	56, 58	I. 13. II. 177, &c.

JOHN.

INDEX

JOHN.

Chap.	Ver.	Page.
ix.	35, &c.	I. 27
—	38	— 47
x.	15, 27	— 30
—	25	— 27
—	33	— 31
—	34	— 35
xi.	27	— 21, 41
—	35	II. 21
—	36	I. 21
xii.	41	I. 14, II. 7, 51
xiv.	9, &c.	I. 40
—	13, 14	I. 46, II. 143
—	28	I. 43, II. 127
xv.	26	II. 104
xvi.	13, 19	I. 45
xvii.	5	I. 97, II. 7
—	6	II. 10
xviii.	5	— 179
xix.	28	— 21
xx.	21	I. 69
—	28	I. 41, II. 93, 97
xxi.	17	II. 7, 27

ACTS.

i.	2, 11, 22	II. 105
—	24	I. 69
ii.	34	9
iii.	12	27
iv.	8	II. 177
vii.	58	I. 72
ix.	1, &c.	70
—	14	82
xi.	26	82
xvii.	29	II. 36
xx.	28	93
xxii.	16	I. 82
xxiii.	6	II. 193

ROMANS.

i.	3	II. 63
—	4, 7	— 93
—	5	I. 70

D d 2

ROMANS.

INDEX

ROMANS.

Chap.	Ver.	Pag.
i.	20	I. 56, 80
—	25	— 80
iii.	29	— 67
v.	14	— 58
—	25	— 72
viii.	33	I. 27. II. 54
ix.	1	I. 87
—	5	II. 7, 61, 93
—	33	I. 17
—	12, 19	I. 81. II. 69
xi.	25	II. 66
—	36	I. 91
xiv.	11	II. 93
xvi.	7	I. 91

1 CORINTHIANS.

i.	1, &c.	I. 70. II. 93
—	3	I. 78
—	8	II. 19
—	17, &c.	— 11
ii.	1	II. 32
—	8	— 7
viii.	6	— 18
ix.	12	— 58
x.	4, 9	I. 15. II. 93
xv.	24	II. 70

2 CORINTHIANS.

i.	1, 2	II. 93
ii.	8	I. 14
iv.	4	II. 68
xi.	31	— 66, 72
xii.	8, 19	I. 88
xiii.	14	— 84

GALATIANS.

i.	3	I. 91
iv.	7, 8	II. 93

EPHESIANS.

i.	1, 2	II. 93
—	21	I. 97, 188

EPHESIANS.

INDEX

EPHESIANS.

Chap.	Ver.	Page
i.	23	34
iii.	1, &c.	20
—	9	19
—	19	39
iv.	4	108
—	6	73
—	13	89

PHILIPPIANS.

ii.	6, &c.	H. 34, &c.
—	9, &c.	I. 76; H. 9, 188
—	10, 11	II. 93
iv.	20	F. 91

COLOSSIANS.

i.	1	II. 93
—	15, &c.	30, 36, 65, 81, 90
—	16	11, 7
ii.	3	27
—	8, 9	I. 137; II. 55
—	10	II. 189

1 THESSALONIANS.

iii.	11	I. 86
------	----	-------

2 THESSALONIANS.

ii.	16	I. 86
-----	----	-------

1 TIMOTHY.

ii.	17	I. 88
iii.	16	II. 50, 63, 95, &c, 189

2 TIMOTHY.

ii.	22	I. 83
iv.	18	91

TITUS.

ii.	13	II. 7
iii.	10	I. 138

HEBREWS.

INDEX

HEBREWS.

Chap.	Vers.	Pag.
i.	2, &c.	I. 14, 77
—	—	II. 6, 7, 43, 90
—	8, &c.	61, 71
—	13	I. 9
—	14	II. 189
ii.	4	II. 104
—	7, 9	46
iii.	3	44
iv.	12, 13	I. 90
—	14	89
—	15	43
v.	7, 8	44
—	16	90
vii.	25	89
ix.	24	90
xi.	3	II. 44
xii.	22, 23	II. 189
xiii.	8	43, 183
—	20	I. 18
—	20, 21	92

1 PETER.

i.	12	II. 104, 183
—	17	I. 83
—	20	II. 103
ii.	8	I. 17
iii.	18	II. 63
—	22	188

2 PETER.

ii.	1	II. 16
iii.	2	I. 70
—	18	92

1 JOHN.

i.	1, 2	II. 97, 104, 170
—	3	45
ii.	22	I. 160. II. 84
iii.	8	II. 104
iv.	13	I. 160. II. 84
—	9	I. 27. II. 5, 175
—	15	II. 84
v.	5	84

1 JOHN

I N D E X.

Chap.	Ver.	Pag.
v.	6	104
—	7	II. 106
—	11, 12	97
—	20	7, 94

2 JOHN.

3	I. 84. II. 43
7	I. 160. II. 84
10	I. 138

JUDE.

17	I. 70
----	-------

REVELATION.

i.	4	I. 85
—	5, 6	92
—	8, 11, 17, 18	I. 14. II. 3, 183
ii.	23	I. 72. II. 7, 27
iii.	1, 6	I. 76, 86
iv.	9, 10	I. 90
v.	8, &c.	I. 74. &c. II. 53
—	13	I. 91, 97
—	16	90
vii.	9	91
x.	6	II. 187
xi.	15	71
xiv.	7	187
xvii.	8	17
—	14	7
xix.	13	171
—	16	7
xxi.	6	II. 183
xxii.	1	I. 76
—	13	II. 183

INDEX

Page	Chapter
104	I.
105	II.
106	III.
107	IV.
108	V.
109	VI.
110	VII.
111	VIII.
112	IX.
113	X.
114	XI.
115	XII.
116	XIII.
117	XIV.
118	XV.
119	XVI.
120	XVII.
121	XVIII.
122	XIX.
123	XX.
124	XXI.
125	XXII.
126	XXIII.
127	XXIV.
128	XXV.
129	XXVI.
130	XXVII.
131	XXVIII.
132	XXIX.
133	XXX.
134	XXXI.
135	XXXII.
136	XXXIII.
137	XXXIV.
138	XXXV.
139	XXXVI.
140	XXXVII.
141	XXXVIII.
142	XXXIX.
143	XL.
144	XL I.
145	XL II.
146	XL III.
147	XL IV.
148	XL V.
149	XL VI.
150	XL VII.
151	XL VIII.
152	XL IX.
153	XL X.
154	XL XI.
155	XL XII.
156	XL XIII.
157	XL XIV.
158	XL XV.
159	XL XVI.
160	XL XVII.
161	XL XVIII.
162	XL XIX.
163	XL XX.
164	XL XXI.
165	XL XXII.
166	XL XXIII.
167	XL XXIV.
168	XL XXV.
169	XL XXVI.
170	XL XXVII.
171	XL XXVIII.
172	XL XXIX.
173	XL XXX.
174	XL XXXI.
175	XL XXXII.
176	XL XXXIII.
177	XL XXXIV.
178	XL XXXV.
179	XL XXXVI.
180	XL XXXVII.
181	XL XXXVIII.
182	XL XXXIX.
183	XL XL.
184	XL XL I.
185	XL XL II.
186	XL XL III.
187	XL XL IV.
188	XL XL V.
189	XL XL VI.
190	XL XL VII.
191	XL XL VIII.
192	XL XL IX.
193	XL XL X.
194	XL XL XI.
195	XL XL XII.
196	XL XL XIII.
197	XL XL XIV.
198	XL XL XV.
199	XL XL XVI.
200	XL XL XVII.
201	XL XL XVIII.
202	XL XL XIX.
203	XL XL XX.
204	XL XL XXI.
205	XL XL XXII.
206	XL XL XXIII.
207	XL XL XXIV.
208	XL XL XXV.
209	XL XL XXVI.
210	XL XL XXVII.
211	XL XL XXVIII.
212	XL XL XXIX.
213	XL XL XXX.
214	XL XL XXXI.
215	XL XL XXXII.
216	XL XL XXXIII.
217	XL XL XXXIV.
218	XL XL XXXV.
219	XL XL XXXVI.
220	XL XL XXXVII.
221	XL XL XXXVIII.
222	XL XL XXXIX.
223	XL XL XL.
224	XL XL XL I.
225	XL XL XL II.
226	XL XL XL III.
227	XL XL XL IV.
228	XL XL XL V.
229	XL XL XL VI.
230	XL XL XL VII.
231	XL XL XL VIII.
232	XL XL XL IX.
233	XL XL XL X.
234	XL XL XL XI.
235	XL XL XL XII.
236	XL XL XL XIII.
237	XL XL XL XIV.
238	XL XL XL XV.
239	XL XL XL XVI.
240	XL XL XL XVII.
241	XL XL XL XVIII.
242	XL XL XL XIX.
243	XL XL XL XX.
244	XL XL XL XXI.
245	XL XL XL XXII.
246	XL XL XL XXIII.
247	XL XL XL XXIV.
248	XL XL XL XXV.
249	XL XL XL XXVI.
250	XL XL XL XXVII.
251	XL XL XL XXVIII.
252	XL XL XL XXIX.
253	XL XL XL XXX.
254	XL XL XL XXXI.
255	XL XL XL XXXII.
256	XL XL XL XXXIII.
257	XL XL XL XXXIV.
258	XL XL XL XXXV.
259	XL XL XL XXXVI.
260	XL XL XL XXXVII.
261	XL XL XL XXXVIII.
262	XL XL XL XXXIX.
263	XL XL XL XL.
264	XL XL XL XL I.
265	XL XL XL XL II.
266	XL XL XL XL III.
267	XL XL XL XL IV.
268	XL XL XL XL V.
269	XL XL XL XL VI.
270	XL XL XL XL VII.
271	XL XL XL XL VIII.
272	XL XL XL XL IX.
273	XL XL XL XL X.
274	XL XL XL XL XI.
275	XL XL XL XL XII.
276	XL XL XL XL XIII.
277	XL XL XL XL XIV.
278	XL XL XL XL XV.
279	XL XL XL XL XVI.
280	XL XL XL XL XVII.
281	XL XL XL XL XVIII.
282	XL XL XL XL XIX.
283	XL XL XL XL XX.
284	XL XL XL XL XXI.
285	XL XL XL XL XXII.
286	XL XL XL XL XXIII.
287	XL XL XL XL XXIV.
288	XL XL XL XL XXV.
289	XL XL XL XL XXVI.
290	XL XL XL XL XXVII.
291	XL XL XL XL XXVIII.
292	XL XL XL XL XXIX.
293	XL XL XL XL XXX.
294	XL XL XL XL XXXI.
295	XL XL XL XL XXXII.
296	XL XL XL XL XXXIII.
297	XL XL XL XL XXXIV.
298	XL XL XL XL XXXV.
299	XL XL XL XL XXXVI.
300	XL XL XL XL XXXVII.
301	XL XL XL XL XXXVIII.
302	XL XL XL XL XXXIX.
303	XL XL XL XL XL.
304	XL XL XL XL XL I.
305	XL XL XL XL XL II.
306	XL XL XL XL XL III.
307	XL XL XL XL XL IV.
308	XL XL XL XL XL V.
309	XL XL XL XL XL VI.
310	XL XL XL XL XL VII.
311	XL XL XL XL XL VIII.
312	XL XL XL XL XL IX.
313	XL XL XL XL XL X.
314	XL XL XL XL XL XI.
315	XL XL XL XL XL XII.
316	XL XL XL XL XL XIII.
317	XL XL XL XL XL XIV.
318	XL XL XL XL XL XV.
319	XL XL XL XL XL XVI.
320	XL XL XL XL XL XVII.
321	XL XL XL XL XL XVIII.
322	XL XL XL XL XL XIX.
323	XL XL XL XL XL XX.
324	XL XL XL XL XL XXI.
325	XL XL XL XL XL XXII.
326	XL XL XL XL XL XXIII.
327	XL XL XL XL XL XXIV.
328	XL XL XL XL XL XXV.
329	XL XL XL XL XL XXVI.
330	XL XL XL XL XL XXVII.
331	XL XL XL XL XL XXVIII.
332	XL XL XL XL XL XXIX.
333	XL XL XL XL XL XXX.
334	XL XL XL XL XL XXXI.
335	XL XL XL XL XL XXXII.
336	XL XL XL XL XL XXXIII.
337	XL XL XL XL XL XXXIV.
338	XL XL XL XL XL XXXV.
339	XL XL XL XL XL XXXVI.
340	XL XL XL XL XL XXXVII.
341	XL XL XL XL XL XXXVIII.
342	XL XL XL XL XL XXXIX.
343	XL XL XL XL XL XL.
344	XL XL XL XL XL XL I.
345	XL XL XL XL XL XL II.
346	XL XL XL XL XL XL III.
347	XL XL XL XL XL XL IV.
348	XL XL XL XL XL XL V.
349	XL XL XL XL XL XL VI.
350	XL XL XL XL XL XL VII.
351	XL XL XL XL XL XL VIII.
352	XL XL XL XL XL XL IX.
353	XL XL XL XL XL XL X.
354	XL XL XL XL XL XL XI.
355	XL XL XL XL XL XL XII.
356	XL XL XL XL XL XL XIII.
357	XL XL XL XL XL XL XIV.
358	XL XL XL XL XL XL XV.
359	XL XL XL XL XL XL XVI.
360	XL XL XL XL XL XL XVII.
361	XL XL XL XL XL XL XVIII.
362	XL XL XL XL XL XL XIX.
363	XL XL XL XL XL XL XX.
364	XL XL XL XL XL XL XXI.
365	XL XL XL XL XL XL XXII.
366	XL XL XL XL XL XL XXIII.
367	XL XL XL XL XL XL XXIV.
368	XL XL XL XL XL XL XXV.
369	XL XL XL XL XL XL XXVI.
370	XL XL XL XL XL XL XXVII.
371	XL XL XL XL XL XL XXVIII.
372	XL XL XL XL XL XL XXIX.
373	XL XL XL XL XL XL XXX.
374	XL XL XL XL XL XL XXXI.
375	XL XL XL XL XL XL XXXII.
376	XL XL XL XL XL XL XXXIII.
377	XL XL XL XL XL XL XXXIV.
378	XL XL XL XL XL XL XXXV.
379	XL XL XL XL XL XL XXXVI.
380	XL XL XL XL XL XL XXXVII.
381	XL XL XL XL XL XL XXXVIII.
382	XL XL XL XL XL XL XXXIX.
383	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL.
384	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL I.
385	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL II.
386	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL III.
387	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL IV.
388	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL V.
389	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL VI.
390	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL VII.
391	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL VIII.
392	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL IX.
393	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL X.
394	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XI.
395	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XII.
396	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XIII.
397	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XIV.
398	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XV.
399	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XVI.
400	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XVII.
401	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XVIII.
402	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XIX.
403	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XX.
404	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XXI.
405	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XXII.
406	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XXIII.
407	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XXIV.
408	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XXV.
409	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XXVI.
410	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XXVII.
411	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XXVIII.
412	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XXIX.
413	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XXX.
414	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XXXI.
415	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XXXII.
416	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XXXIII.
417	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XXXIV.
418	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XXXV.
419	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XXXVI.
420	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XXXVII.
421	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XXXVIII.
422	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XXXIX.
423	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL.
424	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL I.
425	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL II.
426	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL III.
427	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL IV.
428	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL V.
429	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL VI.
430	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL VII.
431	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL VIII.
432	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL IX.
433	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL X.
434	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XI.
435	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XII.
436	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XIII.
437	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XIV.
438	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XV.
439	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XVI.
440	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XVII.
441	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XVIII.
442	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XIX.
443	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XX.
444	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XXI.
445	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XXII.
446	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XXIII.
447	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XXIV.
448	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XXV.
449	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XXVI.
450	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XXVII.
451	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XXVIII.
452	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XXIX.
453	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XXX.
454	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XXXI.
455	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XXXII.
456	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XXXIII.
457	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XXXIV.
458	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XXXV.
459	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XXXVI.
460	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XXXVII.
461	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XXXVIII.
462	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XXXIX.
463	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL.
464	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL I.
465	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL II.
466	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL III.
467	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL IV.
468	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL V.
469	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL VI.
470	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL VII.
471	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL VIII.
472	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL IX.
473	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL X.
474	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XI.
475	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XII.
476	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XIII.
477	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XIV.
478	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XV.
479	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XVI.
480	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XVII.
481	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XVIII.
482	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XIX.
483	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XX.
484	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XXI.
485	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XXII.
486	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XXIII.
487	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XXIV.
488	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XXV.
489	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XXVI.
490	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XXVII.
491	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XXVIII.
492	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XXIX.
493	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XXX.
494	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XXXI.
495	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XXXII.
496	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XXXIII.
497	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XXXIV.
498	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XXXV.
499	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XXXVI.
500	XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XL XXXVII.



CITATIONS from the PRIMITIVE FATHERS, in Vindication of the Doctrine of the TRINITY, and of our LORD'S DIVINITY.

I. I, 2, 3. denotes the several Parts of *The Vindication of the Doctrine of the Trinity*, published 1753. II. denotes Answer to Mr. *Lindsey*. III. this Letter.

The right Hand Column sets forth the Time, in which the several Writers flourish'd, according to Dr. *Cave*.

- A. D.
- 34. Barnabas per Coteler. Amst. 1724. III. p. 159.
 - 65. Hermas per eund. III. p. 162.
 - 65. Clemens Episc. Rom. per eund. II. p. 93, 103. III. p. 108.
 - Constitut. Apostol. per eund. II. p. 94, 106.
 - 101. Ignatius Episc. Antioch. per eund. I. 2. p. 31. II. p. 93, 103, 128. III. p. 75, 84, 94, 103, 164, &c.
 - 108. Polycarpus Episc. Smyrn. per eund. II. p. 103. III. p. 163.
 - 147. Ecclesia Smyrnenfis, per eund. II. p. 94, 103. III. 133, &c.
 - 140. Justinus Martyr. per Sylburg. Par. 1615. I. 1. p. 41, 45. I. 2. p. 71, 99. I. 3. p. 20, 28, &c. II. p. 5, 12, 52, 104, 128, 134. III. p. 12, 31, 49, 90, 91, 120, 155, &c. 160, 178, 180.

Citations from the

A. D.

167. Irenæus Episc. Lugdun. per Grabe, Oxon. 1702.
I. 1. p. 45. I. 2. p. 18, 25, 31, 68, 100. I.
3. p. 114. II. p. 6, 12, 63, 108, 128, 136,
159. III. p. 19, 23, 40, 65, 69, 81, 82, 87,
108, 171, 178.
168. Theophilus Episc. Antioch. per Sylburg. I. 2.
p. 30.
170. Melito Episc. Sard. ap. Cave, Hist. Lit. III.
p. 37.
172. Tatianus, per Sylburg. I. 2. p. 71.
177. Athenagoras, per eund. I. 1. p. 45, 48. I. 2. p.
30, 71. II. p. 107.
192. Clemens Alexandr. per Sylburg. Par. 1629. I. 1.
p. 37, 60, 62. I. 2. p. 31, 72. I. 3. p. 102.
II. p. 95, 109. III. p. 46, 75, 94, 161, 180.
192. Tertullianus per Pamelium, 1662. I. 2. p. 18,
25, 30, 33, 68, 71, 72, 88. I. 3. p. 20, 101,
104. II. p. 6, 52, 63, 110, 128, 136, 159.
III. p. 19, 29, 40, 46, 49, 65, 75, 81, 83,
121, 171, 185.
210. Caius Presbyt. Rom. ap. Euseb. II. 113, 130.
220. Hippolytus Episc. Port. per Fabric. 1716. I. 1.
p. 48. I. 2. p. 19, 30, 59. I. 3. p. 105. II.
p. 53. III. p. 65, 75, 103, 171.
230. Origenes per Spencer, Cantab. 1658. I. 1. p.
48, 96. I. 2. p. 19, 24, 58, 68, 71, 72, 75.
I. 3. p. 104, 118. II. p. 32, 53, 108, 118,
&c. III. p. 17, 19, 29, 46, 49, 65, 149, 171,
178.
233. Cyprianus Episc. Carthag. per Fell, Oxon. 1682.
I. 2. p. 17, 19, 58. I. 3. p. 101. II. p. 54,
112. III. p. 49, 65.
251. Novatianus. I. 1. p. 41, 49. I. 2. p. 19, 30,
41, 44, 46, 49, 68. I. 3. p. 20, 118. II. p. 6,
37, 109, 111. III. p. 19, 29, 31, 40, 65, 121,
178, 180, 185.
254. Gregorius Thaumaturgus. II. p. 65.
254. Dionysius Episc. Alexandr. ap. Euseb. & Athanas.
I. 1. p. 48. I. 2. p. 33, 71. I. 3. p. 22, 104,
117. III. p. 122, 123.

Primitive Fathers.

A. D.

264. Synodus Antioch. ap. Labbe Concil. I. 2. p. 19.
I. 3. p. 18, 122. II. p. 114. III. p. 41, 65,
119.
270. Theognostus, ap. Athanas. I. 2. p. 71.
290. Victorinus Episc. Patav. Bibl. P. P. Par. 1609.
III. p. 81.
290. Methodius Episc. Tyr. ap. Phot. I. 2. p. 30.
303. Arnobius. Hanov. 1603. II. p. 113.
303. Lactantius. Lugd. 1548. I. 2. p. 71. II. p. 123,
&c. III. p. 150, &c.
313. Alexandr. Episc. Alexandr. ap. Theod. I. 1. p.
48. I. 2. p. 71, 72. I. 3. p. 104, 116, 117.
III. p. 46, 123.
315. Eusebius Episc. Cæsar. per Vales. Par. 1678.
I. 1. p. 17, &c. 63. I. 2. p. 25. I. 3. p. 18, 32.
II. p. 9, 11, 113, 132. III. p. 40, 81, 99, 113,
119, 124, 134, 171, 180.
326. Athanasius Episc. Alexandr. Colon. 1686. I. 2.
p. 24, 34, 71. I. 3. p. 17, 18, 21, 32, 105,
116, 117, 121, 126. II. p. 65, 96, 117, 121,
&c. III. p. 122, &c.

Lately printed by J. and J. FLETCHER, in the
Turle, Oxford.

THE Reasonableness of requiring Subscription to Articles
of Religion from Persons to be admitted in Holy Or-
ders, or a Cure of Souls, vindicated, in a Charge delivered
to the Clergy of the Diocese of Oxford, in the Year 1771.

The Certainty of a Future State asserted and vindicated
against the Exceptions of the late Lord Bolingbroke. —
A Sermon preached before the University of Oxford.

An Answer to a Pamphlet, entitled, Reflections on the Im-
propriety of Lay-Subscription to the 39 Articles, in the Uni-
versity of Oxford. Addressed to the Author.

An Answer to a Pamphlet, entitled, Considerations on the
Propriety of requiring a Subscription to Articles of Faith.

The Excellency of the Jewish Law considered. In Two
Sermons preached before the University of Oxford. To which
is added an Appendix: And also a short Comment on Psalm
CIX. and LV. wherein they are shewn not to be Imprecatory
but Prophetical.

Christ the Lord of Glory. — A Sermon before the Uni-
versity of Oxford, with Additions, confirming and enforcing
the Doctrine.

The Use of Reason in Matters of Religion stated and ex-
plained. — A Sermon before the University of Oxford.

Jephtha's Vow considered. — A Sermon before the Uni-
versity of Oxford. With an Appendix, &c.

The Witness of the Spirit. — A Sermon before the Uni-
versity of Oxford.

The Doctrine of Justification by Faith, explained in a Ser-
mon before the University of Oxford.

A Vindication of the Doctrine of the Trinity, from the
Exceptions of a late Pamphlet, entitled, an Essay on Spirit, in
three Parts, with an Appendix.

A Vindication of the Worship of the Son and Holy Ghost,
against the exceptions of Mr. Lindsey, being a Supplement to
the Vindication of the Doctrine of the Trinity.

••• The above are all by the Rev. THOMAS RANDOLPH,
D. D. President of C. C. C. Lady Margaret's Professor of
Divinity, and Archdeacon of Oxford.

